The Office of this JOURNAL *and of the* WEEKLY REPORTER *is now at* 12, *Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.*

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *is*—*Town*, 26*s*., *Country* 28*s*.; *with the* WEEKLY REPORTER, 52*s*. *Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office*—*cloth*, 2*s*. 6*d*.; *half law calf*, 5*s*.

*** *We must draw the attention of correspondents to the rule that all letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.*

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JULY 11, 1874.

THE DETAILS given by Lord Selborne at the meeting of the Legal Education Association of the attendance at the classes established by the Inns of Court fully justify the criticisms we ventured to make upon the scheme of the benchers when it was first promulgated. The warmest supporters of the scheme must admit that it has proved a failure. Yet, as Lord Selborne pointed out, it has in one important respect paved the way for the establishment of a school of law on the basis advocated by the association. The resolution of the benchers, authorising the Council of Legal Education to admit persons not being members of any Inn of Court to attend the lectures of the professors, has established the principle of the education in common of students for both branches of the legal profession. The practical results of the resolution have been precisely such as might have been expected from the ludicrously limited application given by it to the principle involved. Two persons only have availed themselves of the privilege, but the concession of the principle has removed one of the objections most persistently urged to the proposals of the association. It is no longer open to the benchers to contend that any harm can come of the education in the same classes of intending barristers and solicitors. The establishment of a compulsory examination for all candidates for admission to the bar has accomplished another result contended for by the association; so that the issue is now in principle narrowed to the questions whether legal education shall be conducted, as Lord Selborne put it, upon a footing of public authority and public responsibility, under the safeguards and guarantees of public regulation, and whether the organization shall be such that the constitution of the governing body of the new school of law will not give an undue preponderance of power to any particular branch of the legal profession. We venture to think that after the concession of the principle of education in common of both branches of the profession, there can be only one answer to the latter question. The education of both branches must not be under the control of one branch only. As to the principle of public responsibility, we apprehend that Parliament will have no difficulty in deciding upon the respective merits, as directors of legal education, of voluntary and irresponsible societies and of a public and responsible corporation. Of course, as Lord Selborne said, there is no chance of the measures he has framed even reaching a second reading this session, but he has done well to lay them before the public, and we are sanguine that they will meet with the support which will be needed to carry them through Parliament in a future session.

MR. CHARLEY'S BILL OF PAINS AND PENALTIES has passed the second reading in the Commons, and the "legal accountants" will do well to make preparations for burning their circulars and taking down their signs. We do not agree with the hon member that it is the duty of the State to prevent foolish people from being preyed upon, but we do most cordially assent to the more reasonable proposition of the Solicitor-General—that any person who holds himself out as qualified to do legal work for which he has not, in fact, the proper qualification, ought to be punished; and a measure affording an easy and inexpensive process of enforcing this punishment ought to be passed by the House in the interest of the public. Clause 2 of Mr. Charley's Bill subjects to a penalty of £10 any person who wilfully and falsely pretends to be, or takes or uses any name, title, addition, or description implying that he is duly qualified to act as, an attorney or solicitor, or that he is recognised by law as so qualified, or who acts as an attorney or solicitor without being duly qualified so to act. It also provides that "no costs, fee, reward, or disbursement on account of, or in relation to, any act or proceeding done or taken [or made] by any person who acts as an attorney or solicitor without being duly qualified so to act, shall be recoverable in any action, suit, or matter by any person or persons whomsoever." The meaning of this is plain, but the expression is unhappy. It ought obviously to be "any act or proceeding done or taken by any person *while* acting as an attorney or solicitor, &c." As it stands it would, apparently, prevent a "legal accountant" from recovering his fees for balancing a merchant's books. Another clause of the section enables any offence under the Act to be prosecuted before a court of summary jurisdiction in manner provided by the Summary Jurisdiction Acts. Section 3 imposes a penalty of £10, recoverable in any county court, on "any person who not being a qualified practitioner either directly or indirectly, for or in expectation of any fee, gain, or reward, draws or prepares any instrument, or who shall receive any fee, gain, or reward for drawing or preparing any instrument" other than certain excepted instruments; and section 4 proposes to enact that no bill of sale or other document comprised in the Bills of Sale Act, and thereby required to be registered, shall be of any force, unless there shall be present [at the execution thereof] a certificated attorney or solicitor on behalf of the person giving the bill of sale, expressly named by him and attending at his request, to inform him of the nature and effect of such bill of sale before the same is executed, and such attorney or solicitor shall subscribe his name as a witness, and thereby declare himself to be the attorney or solicitor for the person giving the same, and state that he subscribes as such attorney or solicitor.

The Bill needs revision in language, but, if carried, it is likely to prove a useful measure, and Mr. Charley deserves much credit for his efforts to pass it into law. But why so much blowing of trumpets to herald this little Bill, and why so much anguish about the "apathy" of the profession? The measure is quite as much for the interest of the public as of the profession.

THE POWER given to the Court of Chancery, by the 79th section of the Companies Act, 1862, to wind up a company incorporated under that Act, "whenever the court is of opinion that it is just and equitable that the company should be wound up," was one certain to be invoked on behalf of shareholders despairing of the success of their company. A similar provision was contained in the Winding-up Act (11 & 12 Vict. c. 45, s. 5, clause 8); and though this corresponding provision was held by Lord Cottenham in *Spackman's case* (1 Mac. & G. 173) to embrace only matters *ejusdem generis* as those in the previous clauses, yet it is plain that it might be very strongly argued that, with respect to the probable success or failure of a company, the court has *data* before it in the case of a limited company, which it has not when the company is unlimited, and accordingly that decisions on the old Act could hardly be considered binding when the court had to deal with the newly-created limited companies. In the case of a limited company the court knows the utmost extent of the capital remaining to be received, and it is thus in a position to form an opinion on the probable success of the under-

taking. If that view had been followed it is certain that the Court of Chancery would have been inundated with applications by timid shareholders, and would have been incessantly called upon to prognosticate the future of trading speculations of all kinds. Fortunately, however, this view has not been admitted, and it is now definitely settled that the clause in the 79th section to which we have referred must be considered to provide only for cases *ejusdem generis* as those specifically mentioned; in other words, that to make the clause applicable there must be either insolvency or an incapability of continuing the business for some other reason (*In re Suburban Hotel Company*, 15 W. R. 1096, L. R. 2 Ch. 737). Dissentient shareholders, therefore, unless they can show that the company is insolvent or cannot continue its business, will be held to their contract both to supply a certain share of the capital and to submit to the will of the majority. This principle was acted upon on the 4th inst. by Hall, V.C., in the case of *The Air Gas Light Company* (*Limited*). Since the filing of the petition a meeting had been called in accordance with the order of the court, and at that meeting the shareholders resolved to carry on the concern. It may occasionally be hard on shareholders, competent to form an opinion on the prospects of the company, to be overborne by perhaps an ignorant majority or by the holders of fully paid up shares, whose plain interest it may be to force the full payment up of all the other shares on the mere bare chance of success; but it is evident that on the whole the rule on which the court acts, while it is clearly the intention of the statute, also indirectly prevents many speculative applications to the court, and much consequent annoyance to the holders of shares in companies.

Parliamentary Reporting appears to be rapidly becoming a lost art, and it is not very easy to gather from the newspaper reports the purport of the question asked by Mr. Goldney in the House of Commons a few days ago on the subject of the Chancery Funds Rules now in force, and the loss sustained by infants entitled to small sums in court. We presume, however, that it had reference to the practice introduced by the 33rd of the Chancery Funds Rules, 1872, the last clause of which provides that, subject to certain exceptions, all money paid into court after the commencement of the Court of Chancery (Funds) Act, 1872, shall be placed on deposit without a request for that purpose. Under this rule, money paid in under the Infants' Legacy Act is immediately placed on deposit, and gains interest at two per cent. from that time. Upon the whole it looks as if the balance of convenience was in favour of this plan, because, although an investment in Consols would produce larger interest, yet the expense of obtaining an order for investment might exceed the difference in the amount of gain. We do not think many instances of loss occur in these infant's cases; and we fail to understand Mr. W. H. Smith's statement that the new Chancery Funds Rules, about to be issued, will go far to remedy the alleged grievance.

A correspondent informs us, however, of some curious instances of grossly disproportionate expenditure incurred by suitors in consequence of another rule connected with the deposit system. The 38th rule says, "A sum of money in court less than £100 shall not be invested in pursuance of an order made after the commencement of these rules, unless such order shall direct the investment to be made notwithstanding that the sum shall not amount to £100. This rule shall extend to the investment of dividends accruing on securities in court, which, by an order, have been, or may be directed to be invested, and such dividends, when amounting to less than £100 half yearly are (not being less than £3) to be placed on deposit until by accumulation they amount to a sum not less than £100, when such sum shall, upon a request in writing by or on behalf of any person claiming to be entitled thereto or interested therein, be withdrawn from deposit and invested as directed by such order." The result of this rule is that an order to invest a sum not exceeding £100, or dividends, is a delusion unless, in the latter case, the dividends amount to £100 at each payment. Dividends on stock are payable half-yearly; they follow the stock and there is no necessity for calculating their amount for the purpose of stating it in an order. Interest on money on deposit, on the contrary, accrues every month, but is only credited half-yearly. When it becomes necessary to clear a fund for the purpose of division the money on deposit must be withdrawn for the purpose of calculating and crediting the interest. However small the amount may be, two or three attendances are necessary to effect this object, and an instance was a few months ago brought to the notice of our correspondent in which the expense of ascertaining that the interest amounted to 1s. 4d. was very nearly £2 2s. 0d. This compulsory placing on deposit, instead of investing, he thinks forms a grievance which the expected rules ought to provide against.

Lord Romilly has this week boldly departed from the lines laid down by his predecessor in the European Assurance Arbitration on the subject of novation. Lord Westbury said in *Pratt's case* (18 S. J. 25), he had "over and over again stated that he would not be misled by the term 'novation,' that he would not pay any attention to it, unless the parties could show him that there was an express contract to substitute the second company instead of the first, and that the parties entered into that contract knowingly and advisedly, and that they entered into the contract that the second should bear the burden, and not only bear it as well as the first, but that they should bear it to the exclusion of the first, and in substitution for the first." The decision in *Pratt's case* was no more than a logical following out of these principles—principles which had been carefully considered, and were most tenaciously held by Lord Westbury. In the case just decided by Lord Romilly (*Talbot's case*), he admitted that the facts could not be distinguished from those in *Pratt's case*. Both cases were cases of indorsement of policies, the indorsing company, in consideration of the assured agreeing to the transfer of the policy, undertaking to perform the stipulations of the policy. Lord Westbury, of course, held, in *Pratt's case*, that there was no novation, while Lord Romilly, in *Talbot's case*, held that a novation had been effected.

It is perhaps too much to expect that Lord Romilly should in a very large and important class of cases feel himself bound to follow his predecessor in what he considers to be bad law; still we cannot but regret that he has treated *Pratt's case* as of less weight than it actually was, in consequence of Lord Westbury's being "notoriously unwell," at the time of its decision. We can have no doubt that, if Lord Westbury had lived to decide *Talbot's case* in a state of perfect health, he would have followed the principles he had so often laid down. If cases are to be weighed with reference to the judge's bodily condition at the time of his judgment it will be best to allow no judge to hear or determine cases except upon production of a medical certificate.

THE LAND TRANSFER BILL IN THE COMMONS.

On Tuesday evening, in a thin and listless House, the Attorney-General moved the second reading of the Land Transfer Bill. The only points of interest in his speech were his references to the questions of district registries and compulsion. As to the former, while repeating the remarks of the Lord Chancellor, with regard to the distance which the district registries might be from many country solicitors, he frankly avowed that it would be eventually necessary to establish registries throughout the country. Upon the question of compulsion he expressed an opinion that if the clause relating to it were struck out, the Bill would be shorn of one of its great merits; but he threw out a hint that the Government were ready to "consider" carefully the representations which

might be made on this subject in committee. It is to be noted that Sir John Karslake, who, but for his universally lamented affliction, would have had charge of the measure, expressed a hope that it would be found necessary to extend the registries throughout the country, and after admitting that he regarded the Bill as more or less experimental, suggested that the question of compulsion "might very properly be considered in committee." It may probably be concluded that upon this point the Government are open to pressure.

As to the rest of the debate we shall, we think, do no injustice to the learned speakers if we say that while some of them had apparently not read the Bill at all, others had read it, but did not understand it, and some few had both read and understood it. Among these latter was Sir Francis Goldsmid, who fastened with the acuteness of a practised conveyancer upon its weak points. His thorough mastery of the measure will be of the greatest service in committee, but it led him into details which seemed inappropriate to the second reading, and tended to the conclusion that it was not so much the principle as the machinery of the Bill that he objected to. This was avowed by his seconder, Mr. H. M. Jackson, as his position, and he devoted the greater part of an admirably terse and lucid speech to combating the application of compulsion. He stated that the report of the Commission on which the Bill was professedly founded contained no hint of compulsion; that in fact the commissioners contemplated a tentative and experimental measure, and that so recently as last year Lord Cairns had expressed himself as hostile to compulsion. Curiously enough, however, neither Mr. Jackson nor, we believe, any of the other speakers who advocated the omission of the compulsion clause, urged the really unanswerable objection to the immediate enactment of that clause, viz.: that since it is not to come into operation for three years it should be left to be enacted three years hence. The arguments on the one side and on the other seemed to be based on the assumption that you must either enact compulsion in the Bill now before the House, or reject it altogether. We need hardly point out, what we hope will be strongly urged in committee, that there are many lawyers who think that compulsion will be essential to a system of land transfer which has been tested and found to be workable, but who object to making a system compulsory before it has been tried.

Considering the views expressed by the law officers of the late Government, we may regard it as matter of congratulation that the course of events has taken the Bill out of their hands. Sir Henry James expressed an opinion that small estates under £300 "needed compulsory registration more than larger properties." Now if one thing more than another has been made clear by the discussion the subject has undergone, it has been that the buyers of plots of land for sites of cottages near towns, who constitute the vast majority of purchasers of the estates referred to, get their purchases carried through at a cost and with a speed which leave not the slightest ground for complaint. Again, the late Attorney-General thought fit to refer to "vested interests in a professional point of view" as creating a difficulty in passing the Bill. If he had taken the slightest trouble to inform himself on the subject, he would have found as a matter of fact that the great body of lawyers have carefully abstained from offering any opposition to the passing of the Bill. But the want of acquaintance with the subject displayed by the senior law officer of the late Government was far surpassed by his late colleague. Sir W. V. Harcourt opined that the fault of the Bill was "not that it was too compulsory, but that it was not half compulsory enough," and one of the reasons he assigned for this opinion was that if registration was good, "why should it not apply to land held in mortmain"? Considering that, except under very rare circumstances, land in mortmain (which means, properly, land held by corporations) is not sold or transferred, and does not suffer from complexity or infirmity of title, we think that the remark must be considered as somewhat unfortunate.

THE BRUSSELS CONFERENCE.

We have as yet no further official information respecting the Brussels Conference beyond Lord Derby's reply to the Earl of Denbigh yesterday week. Mr. Disraeli declined on Tuesday to add anything to Lord Derby's statement, and the papers containing the official correspondence have not yet been presented to Parliament. So far as we can judge at present, Lord Derby seems to have adopted a judicious course. We have reason to believe that the principal, if not the only, business announced for the Conference is the consideration of the laws of land warfare. The *Independance Belge* of the 23rd of June contains a *projet de convention* of seventy articles, which, it states, is to be "the object of the deliberations of the Congress." This *projet* relates exclusively to the laws of land warfare. The two articles Lord Denbigh quoted from a *resumé* in a Vienna paper of what Prince Gortschakoff intended to propose also evidently relate to land warfare. This likewise seems to us implied in Lord Derby's language. It would be improper to "protest against any extension of the scope of the Conference which would include maritime warfare," if that were included in its scope as originally proposed.

If the principal business of the Conference be the rules of land warfare, it would be very unfortunate if our Government held aloof. During the late Franco-German war it appeared not only that these rules are far from being definitely settled, but also that the uncertainty and the different views taken by the French and German Governments respectively greatly aggravated the sufferings of the inhabitants of the invaded provinces, and produced a great deal of ill-feeling, which might have been avoided if the belligerents had previously agreed upon a set of rules, and made them known to their respective subjects. There is no similar necessity for detailed rules in naval warfare, for while the soldiers of an invading army are in constant contact with the inhabitants, the crews of the ships of different belligerents only come in contact when a prize is taken, and then the prize courts take cognisance of any ill-treatment of the crew of the captured vessel.

A special reason for desiring that England should be represented at the Conference is that upon one important point in land warfare—viz., the mode of procuring provisions, our system of ready money payments is very preferable to the continental system of requisitions, which the *projet* published in the *Independance Belge* proposes to continue; as requisitions not only throw an excessive burden upon the inhabitants of the occupied provinces, but also exhaust the resources of the district by stopping the supplies from flowing in from neighbouring districts. The ready money system was originally forced upon us in India, and its superiority over the requisition system was proved by Wellington in Spain and France.

But though the presence of an English representative at the Conference appears to us to be so desirable, we quite approve of the conditions Lord Derby has annexed to his consent to send a representative, and especially of the final condition that the English representative is not to be a plenipotentiary, but is merely to assist at the discussions, and report the proceedings to our Government. We trust that the Government will not assent to any new rules without obtaining the best military and other advice as to their probable working, and without also giving opportunities for public criticism. At the same time we do not apprehend that any alteration likely to be made in the rules for carrying on land warfare will probably have any serious effect upon the relative power of different States, such as might be produced if the rules of maritime warfare were to be revised at the Conference.

The *projet* published in the *Independance Belge* seems to us to agree in the main with Professor Bluntschi's code and with M. Rolin Jacquemyn's articles on the Franco-German war in the *Revue de Droit International*.

THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT.

II.

One of the inevitable results of the judicial system of which we are just about to see the last was that in certain classes of cases different principles were adopted by different courts, and that, these courts being mutually independent, no sufficient means existed of reconciling these differences; and thus it came to pass that in some important classes of cases, the rights of the parties were made to depend, not upon the circumstances of the case, but upon the *forum* where it happened to be the subject of litigation. To a certain extent this is true of the whole range of equitable jurisdiction, but the cases to which we specially refer differed from the rest in this, that whereas in general it was within the competence of either party to bring into equity every case where any purely equitable right or remedy existed, and so to secure the benefit of every right which could be obtained in either *forum*; in these special instances no such option existed, the jurisdiction being in some cases determined by accidental, and so far as the real merits were concerned immaterial, circumstances, and the *forum* being in other cases absolutely at the discretion of the plaintiff, who might thus, without appeal, materially vary the mutual rights of the parties in whichever direction he considered most beneficial to himself. The most notable instance of the first kind is dealt with by the 1st sub-section, and one of the most remarkable cases of the second kind is the subject of the 9th.

According to the present law the mutual rights of the creditors of an insolvent debtor are materially altered by his death before his insolvency has been officially adjudicated upon. If he has in his lifetime been duly adjudicated bankrupt, his estate is administered by the Court of Bankruptcy, which is bound by the well-known statutory rule as to secured creditors—viz., that they cannot prove for their whole debt without giving up their security, but must either realise the security and prove for the deficiency, or value the security and prove for the residue of the debt; the trustee having, in the latter case, an option to purchase the security, at the value put upon it, for the benefit of the general estate. If, however, this same debtor had happened to die without any adjudication in bankruptcy, his estate would have to be administered in the Court of Chancery, and this single—and, so far as regards the creditors, purely accidental—circumstance, all other things remaining precisely the same, operated so as materially to benefit the partially secured at the expense of the unsecured creditors. For the rule in Chancery is well established that a secured creditor has a right to prove for his whole debt, without reference to his security, and after receiving a dividend on the whole to realise his security at his leisure, without being liable to refund unless he shall have received from all sources more than the full amount of his debt and interest, in which case he is of course obliged to return the surplus to the estate. It is impossible to suppose that rules so contradictory could have been allowed to co-exist but for the fact that they were enforced by different courts with different sets of officers, who habitually looked upon the question from different points of view; and it would be manifestly absurd to perpetuate such a distinction now that these different jurisdictions are to be exercised by one and the same court. To do so would be to render the identity of the court merely nominal, and to compel it in every such case to consider which of its predecessors it was then representing, and alter its course of action accordingly: in other words, it would perpetuate the dual jurisdiction, though administering both by the same hands, just as the judges of the Court of Exchequer used to exercise both legal and equitable jurisdiction, but without any approach at intermixture or union. The Act accordingly decides that for the future the rule in bankruptcy is to prevail, and the partially secured creditors of insolvents who die after the conclusion of next long vacation will no longer obtain any advantage from the death of the debtor.

It is singular that the Act does not provide for the case of joint stock companies. This is the more remarkable, because the question which of these rules should be applied to such a case has been the subject of a conflict of judicial opinion, and has been settled by the Court of Appeal in favour of the rule which is not for the future to prevail in any other case. The original Joint Stock Companies Act of 1856 provided that companies formed under that Act should be wound up by the Court of Bankruptcy, and that provision was probably considered sufficient to carry with it, and import into every winding up under it, all the rules of that court with regard to the distribution of assets. When the Act of 1862 transferred this jurisdiction to the Court of Chancery this point seems to have been overlooked; at all events that Act is perfectly silent upon the point. The question was, however, one which could not fail to arise and be contested, and accordingly we find that two cases of importance arose about the same time, before two different judges, and were by them determined in opposite senses; Lord Romilly holding that the rule in chancery ought to be followed, and Vice-Chancellor Malins giving the preference to the rule in bankruptcy. Both cases were appealed and heard at the same time before the Lords Justices Wood and Selwyn (*Kellock's case*, L. R. 3 Ch. 769), who decided in favour of the rule in chancery, and that not on the ground that the change of *forum* indicated an intention on the part of the Legislature to alter the rule (which would at least have been intelligible), but expressly upon the inherent superiority in point of justice of the rule in question. The Legislature has, by the section before us, determined that this rule shall no longer be applied in the administration of the estates of deceased persons, and has thus, as it seems to us, declared its preference for the rule in bankruptcy in point of intrinsic merit, but it has left the rule in *Kellock's case* absolutely untouched; and it is at least not improbable that one of the first tasks of the new Court of Appeal will be to decide between the conflicting opinions of a judge who considers himself still bound to follow that case, and a judge who will, doubtless, hold that it has been by implication overruled by this Act of Parliament. The Amendment Act has not yet passed the House of Commons; it is not yet too late to procure the insertion of a short clause extending one uniform rule to all cases whatever; and we trust that some of the legal members of the House will not lose this opportunity of effecting a piece of very useful if not conspicuous legislation.

Before the commencement of the business of the Bradford County Court, on Friday, the judge (Mr. W. T. S. Daniel, Q.C.) referred to a judgment he had recently delivered, in which he had commented on the conduct of one of the attorneys concerned in the case. He said he had received a private communication from the attorney in reference to the remarks he had made. He wished it to be known that he would not receive private communications from anyone. What he did he did in public, and if any attorney wished for any explanation of anything that he might say, he must address him in open court. He was surrounded by persons whose interests were affected by the judgments which he delivered, and if he were to receive private communications of that kind his position would become intolerable. A judge of a county court must be protected from private communications. The remarks which he had made in the case in question were such as he thought were justified by the facts as shown in the evidence. It appeared that the attorney was not in court, and his Honour then said that he would give him an opportunity of withdrawing his letter, and if that were not done he (the judge) would have to refer to the matter afterwards.

REVIEWS.

INDIAN LAW.

The Indian Evidence Act (*I. of* 1872), *together with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes.* By HENRY STUART CUNNINGHAM, Barrister-at-Law, Advocate-General of Madras. Madras: Higginbotham & Co. London: W. Amer.

The Indian Contract Act (*IX. of* 1872), *together with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes.* By H. S. CUNNINGHAM and H. H. SHEPHARD, Barristers-at-Law. Madras: Higginbotham & Co. London: W. Amer.

There is no lack of commentaries on the new Indian Evidence Act. Mr. J. B. Norton and Mr. Field have published exhaustive treatises on it. Mr. Goodson has added it with a few notes as an appendix to his able work on Indian evidence. Last and least in point of size, though not in point of ability, comes Mr. Cunningham's edition, which consists of an introduction, which is mainly an explanation of the principles of the Act, followed by the Act itself, with notes to almost every section. In these notes a good deal of anterior case law, English as well as Indian, has been introduced with a view of elucidating the construction of the sections. Mr. Cunningham, in his preface, modestly disclaims any originality. He does not lay himself out "to offer assistance to those already acquainted with the subject" of his work, but he hopes "the large class of persons who take up the study of the Law of Evidence for the first time may find in this volume some assistance in mastering this important branch of legal study." To students and to those—and unfortunately there are not a few in India—who are called upon to exercise judicial functions without previous legal training, Mr. Cunningham's work cannot fail to be useful.

The joint treatise of Messrs. Cunningham & Shephard on the Indian Contract Act is based upon substantially the same mode of arrangement as the book noticed above. But in the introduction the Act is commented upon very fully, almost section by section, and in the notes appended to the sections of the Act more cases are cited than in the treatise on the Evidence Act, so that the work, besides being useful to the student, will also be of much value to the practitioner.

NOTES.

HOME.

Lord Romilly's decision in *Talbot's case*, on Wednesday last, has drawn fresh attention to the variations of opinion on the subject of novation of the different arbitrators who have had to consider it. On this point the writer of an interesting article in the *Review* says:—

"The principle on which Lord Cairns proceeded throughout the whole of the Albert Arbitration was, that the entire *onus* of showing that there was no novation lay upon the policyholder. He, in fact, considered that when a policyholder paid his premiums to, and accepted receipts from, some other company than that one with which he had originally contracted, then (to quote his own words) 'the burden of explaining the apparent irregularity of the receipt, the apparent variance, the open variance between the receipt, and the payment of the premiums contemplated by the policy,' lay upon the policyholder who produced what was to be considered as an improper receipt. Indeed, in one of the last cases which came before him on the subject of novation, he expressed himself as follows:—'I have, in cases that are now very numerous, held that where persons have allowed themselves to drift into dealing with the amalgamated company, to enter into relations with that new company and pay premiums, and to make no protest with regard to the footing upon which they are paying those premiums, they lose the security of the old company and become creditors of the new.'

"Let us now compare these propositions laid down by Lord Cairns with the principles upon the subject of novation which were established by Lord Westbury. In one of his earlier judgments—several of Lord Cairns' decisions having been cited to him—he said, 'Now it has been argued at the bar here—and I am sorry to say that some colour has been furnished for that argument by some of the technical decisions which have been cited—as if it were incumbent upon the policyholder to prove that he did not intend to adopt and to accept by way of substitution the liability of the transferee company. That is quite an inversion of the proper order. It is incumbent upon the company which alleges a substitution, or what has been termed a novation, to prove an agreement by the policyholder to make that novation, and to prove acts of the policyholder, in the absence of any written declaration, that unequivocally involve the evidence of that intention on the part of the policyholder to accept the new company instead of the old.' The three rules on the subject of novation which Lord Westbury laid down at an early stage of the arbitration for the guidance of counsel, and from which he never subsequently receded in the least, are also express on the point. The third of these rules was that 'the acceptance of the offer by the policyholder should be proved by acts which would unequivocally denote his understanding and acceptance of the proposal, to accept a new contract in lieu of the old.' The following extracts from several of his judgments will, we think, put the matter beyond the possibility of doubt:—'I am extremely unwilling, and shall always remain unwilling, to transfer one policyholder from his original company to another company unless I have clear and indisputable proof that the policyholder did deliberately elect to take a second company in lieu of the former, that must be founded upon facts and circumstances that unmistakeably warrant that conclusion.' 'I have again and again stated that I will not be misled by this term novation, that I will not pay any attention to it unless the parties can show me that there was an express contract to substitute the second company instead of the first, and that the parties entered into that contract knowingly and advisedly, and that they entered into the contract that the second should bear the burden, and not only bear it as well as the first, but that they should bear it to the exclusion of the first and in substitution for the first.' 'I repeat again, I will not transfer a man who is a creditor from one person to another, and bind him to take that course, unless I have most unequivocal proof that it was done with his knowledge, and that he has subsequently assented to it, and that with competent information on the nature of the case he has agreed to accept the new debtor instead of the old.' In *Swift's case* the argument was strongly pressed that Mr. Swift had, by paying his policies to the transferee company, abandoned all right to prove against his original company. To this argument, which would have been, according to Lord Cairns' view of the question, of perfectly irresistible power, Lord Westbury replied as follows:—'What Mr. Swift did was therefore nothing in the world more than an acquiescence in the transfer of that business, and payment of the premiums in accordance with the notice he had received, amounting to no more than this—as if the Royal Naval Society had told him, 'Our bankers are henceforth the London and Westminster or any other; please to pay your premiums into the London and Westminster Bank.' He did pay his premiums to the assignee, agent, and attorney of the Royal Naval Society, he did nothing more.' Lord Westbury consequently held that in this case there was no novation. Lord Cairns would have unquestionably held that such a case as this was the clearest case of novation possible."

The Lords Justices have reversed the decision of Vice-Chancellor Bacon in *Vaughan* v. *Halliday* (22 W. R 508), which related to the application of the doctrine of the well-known case of *Ex parte Waring* (19 Ves. 345). The facts were shortly these. A firm at Bahia drew bills upon a firm at Manchester, at the same time sending them other bills on England to cover their acceptances. The Manchester firm refused to accept the bills drawn upon them, and both the firms went into liquidation. The holder for value of the bills drawn on the Manchester firm (who knew nothing of the specific appropriation when he bought them) claimed to have the other bills applied in payment of the bills of the Bahia firm, and the Vice-Chancellor held that he was entitled, upon the principle of the decision

in *Ex parte Waring*, to have this done. The Lords Justices, however, held that, as the Manchester house had not accepted the bills drawn upon them, it was impossible that *Ex parte Waring* could apply, and they distinctly laid it down that it is essential, in order that *Ex parte Waring* should apply, that there must be, not only a double insolvency, but a right on the part of the bill holder to prove on both the insolvent estates. In *Vaughan* v. *Halliday* the bill holder had no right to prove against the estate of the Manchester firm, as they had not accepted the bills drawn upon them. The Vice-Chancellor appears to have misapprehended the effect of the decision of the Lords Justices in *Ex parte Smart* (21 W. R. 237), which only established that it is not necessary that the right of proof against the two insolvent estates should be against them as drawers and acceptors of the same bills, but that it is sufficient that the right of proof should be in respect of the same debt.

Yesterday the Lords Justices affirmed the decision of the Chief Judge in *Ex parte Naden*, on which we commented *ante* p. 607.

FOREIGN.

France.

In a case heard before the first chamber of the Court of Appeal at Paris on the 20th inst. a question was decided of considerable interest to the theatrical profession in France. M. Cantin, the manager of the *Theatre des Folies Dramatiques*, had engaged Mdlle. Paola-Marié to sustain a part in *La Fille de Madame Angot*. That lady, however, after performing for a few evenings, abruptly quitted the theatre, and refused to fulfil her engagement. M. Cantin thereupon sued her before the Tribunal of Commerce for damages for the loss he sustained by her non-appearance. The Tribunal gave judgment by default, and awarded the damages claimed by M. Cantin. Mdlle. Marié resisted the execution of the judgment on the ground of want of jurisdiction in the court. She contended that her contract with the manager was not an *acte de commerce*, and that her position under that contract was in no way analogous to that of the clerk or servant of a merchant. The Tribunal of Commerce, however, held that it had jurisdiction; that title 2 of the *Code de Commerce* does not limit the jurisdiction of Tribunals of Commerce to disputes relative to *actes de commerce*, and that article 634 of that code showed that the Legislature intended to give to the commercial jurisdiction cognisance of disputes arising between all persons engaged in a commercial undertaking. That article, said the Tribunal, enacts that Tribunals of Commerce shall have jurisdiction in suits against "*commis*" (clerks) of merchants with reference to the business of the merchant; now "*commis*" in the code includes any person who is commissioned by the merchant to represent him before third persons, whose duty it is to take part in a commercial undertaking, to receive the orders of the merchant, and to execute them under his direction; a reference to the form of the theatrical contract shows that the *artistes* bind themselves to execute a certain task, and that they are to execute it under the orders and direction of the manager; hence it follows that, however great may be the talent of the *artiste*, she becomes, when she enters into such a contract, simply the *employé* of a trader, and as such is within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal of Commerce. Mdlle. Marié appealed from this decision. Her counsel (M. Falateuf) argued that the word "*commis*" in the article of the code related exclusively to persons entrusted with part of the work of a commercial house, that an actress did not represent the manager in anything relating to the carrying on, or business part, of a theatrical undertaking, and that consequently the contract of such an *artiste* with the manager was governed by the ordinary law relating to civil contracts. The Court of Appeal, however, confirmed the decision of the Tribunal of Commerce, adopting the reasons given by that court.

United States.

A very singular extension of the jurisdiction of courts of equity in cases of fraud is noticed by the *Albany Law Journal* as having been made by the Court of Errors and Appeals of New Jersey, in the case of *Carris* v. *Carris*. The suit was brought by a husband for a divorce on the ground of fraud. The complainant married the defendant, supposing that she was at the time virtuous; two months after the marriage, however, she gave birth to a child. The court is stated to have "held that it had jurisdiction as a court of equity to annul the marriage on the ground of fraud, and that the want of chastity and concealment avoided the consent and constituted a fraud, upon which a court of equity would declare the marriage void *ab initio*."

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. Francis Hughes, of Bedford-street, Covent-garden, has been appointed a London Commissioner to administer oaths in the Court of Queen's Bench.

Mr. T. D. Dutton, of Churton-street, Pimlico, has been appointed a London Commissioner to administer oaths in Common Law.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

July 3.—*Working Men's Dwellings Bill.*—The Earl of Shaftesbury, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said that it proposed to authorise corporations of boroughs to direct that land vested in them should be laid out in small plots for the erection of dwelling-houses suitable for the occupation of persons employed in manual labour, in accordance with plans to be approved at a public meeting of the burgesses of such boroughs and by the Secretary of State for the Home Department. It further authorised such corporations to make the necessary roads, walls, drains, and other works, to fit the property for use as building land, and to put the land when so improved up for sale by auction in separate parcels, to be conveyed to the purchasers by a simple form of conveyance under the corporate seal, such sales to be subject to the condition that a dwelling-house should be erected on each plot within the term of three years from the date of the purchase on pain of forfeiture.—Lord Napier and Ettrick thought there were imperfections in the Bill, but they were imperfections which could be remedied in committee, and the Bill might be made a very useful measure.—The Lord Chancellor was surprised to hear that there were corporations which had got any amount of land they would be enabled to dispose of in this way. Assuming there were places in which the Bill could be brought into operation, he remarked that although the size of the houses to be built on the land devoted by the corporation to the purpose might be determined as provided for by the Bill, there would still arise the question of title. There was a provision in the Bill which made the town clerk an agent for registering these properties, and which placed him in the position of a land registrar. Now, the provisions of the Land Transfer Bill would be seriously interfered with if the town clerks throughout the country were made land registrars. If it were desirable that corporations should be allowed to parcel out their land for dwellings for the labouring classes, the only way was to give them the power to grant leases. A building lease for ninety-nine years was in London thought to be almost as good as a freehold, and the corporations might insert covenants as to the way in which the land should be used. He did not wish to offer any objection to the second reading, but the Bill would require some revision in committee. The Bill was read a second time.

Conference at Brussels.—The Earl of Denbigh asked whether her Majesty's Government had decided on sending a representative to the Conference at Brussels.—The Earl of Derby: The conference has been set on foot by the Emperor of Russia, and though in many quarters great doubts are entertained as to the possibility of its accomplishing its purpose and leading to any practical results, still all the Governments of the great European Powers, and, I believe, all the various Governments of Europe, have accepted the invitation to send representatives to it. We thought it better, on the part of her Majesty's Government, to wait to the last before giving our reply to the invitation we received. Without giving any particular

discouragement to the proposal, we have not assumed an attitude of confident expectation or belief that any great result would come from the Conference, but, considering that the object put forward is the mitigation of the suffering caused by war, and considering that all the great Military Powers, without exception, have acquiesced in this Conference being held, it seemed to us that absolutely and unconditionally to stand aloof from the discussion which is about to be held would be a proceeding liable to misinterpretation, both upon grounds of humanity and upon grounds of international courtesy. We have therefore decided, not, on the one hand, to refuse that invitation, but, on the other hand, not to accept it unconditionally. We propose to accept it only under certain important reservations and conditions, and these reservations and conditions will be fully stated in the reply which I am now sending. In the first place, we shall state we are firmly determined not to enter into any discussion of the rules of International Law by which the relations of belligerents are guided, or to undertake any new obligation or engagement of any kind in regard to general principles. We further propose to protest against any extension of the scope of the Congress which should include matters relative to maritime operations or to naval warfare; and we have announced that unless we receive distinct and positive assurance that no such extension is contemplated, we shall decline to send a representative to the Conference. Lastly, if a representative should be sent, he will not be invested with plenipotentiary authority; he will not be empowered to consent, on the part of her Majesty's Government, to any concession or to the adoption of any new rule: he will be simply present to assist in the discussions which may be held, and report the proceedings to us. But her Majesty's Government will reserve to itself entire freedom of action in regard to any proposals which may emanate from the Conference.

Apothecaries Act Amendment Bill.—This Bill was read a second time.

Alkali Act Amendment Bill.—The report of amendments in this Bill was received.

July 6.—*Glebe Lands Sale Bill.*—The Bishop of CARLISLE, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it was a restrictive Bill, and if it became law the effect would be, not that a greater number of glebes would be sold but that the money would be applied in a manner more conducive to the good of the Church than at present. A constant conflict was now going on between incumbents who wished to sell their glebes and the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, who wished them to be retained. It was thought, however, that an arrangement might be come to, and the principle of the Bill was contained in the 10th and 11th clauses. By the 10th clause it was competent for the Governors, by arrangement between them and the incumbent, to retain a portion of the annual income to be derived from the investment of the purchase money. This portion so retained would accumulate as an addition to the capital for the permanent benefit of the living, and the residue would be paid to the incumbent.—The LORD CHANCELLOR doubted very much whether the existing powers for authorizing the sale of certain parts of glebe lands were not already too ample. So far as this Bill widened those powers he should be sorry to give his assent to it. The consequence of the Bill would be that the chance of obtaining an additional £10 a year would operate as an inducement to an incumbent to turn the glebe land into money. It was better it should go forth at once that Parliament was not going to encourage clergymen in any wholesale conversion of their land into money. The less clergymen turned their minds to the question of selling glebe lands the better would it be for the interest of the Church.—Lord SELBORNE doubted very much whether it would be well to hold out any such inducement as was held out by the Bill to sell for special terms in cases not otherwise desirable. After a short conversation the Bill was withdrawn.

Building Societies Bill.—This Bill was read a second time.

Leases and Sales of Settled Estates Act Amendment Bill.—This Bill passed through Committee.

Board of Trade Inquiries, &c., Bill.—This Bill was recommitted and certain amendments were agreed to.

July 7.—*Licensing Act Amendment Bill.*—The House went into committee on this Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

Clause 3 was agreed to, after amendments by Lord ABERDARE to alter the time of closing on week-nights in the metropolis to twelve, and by Earl MORLEY to leave out the words relating to "a populous place," had been respectively negatived and withdrawn.—The DUKE of RICHMOND undertook that the latter question should receive further consideration.

Clause 4 (repeal of exemption as to theatres) was agreed to.

On clause 5 (exemption as to harvesting, &c.), Earl NELSON moved the omission of certain words at the end of the clause, the effect of which, if retained, would be, while professing to give the magistrates greater power, really to restrict the power which they possessed under clause 26 of the Act of 1872. The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 6, 7, and 8, with certain verbal amendments, were agreed to.

Clause 9 was omitted.

Clause 10 was agreed to.

Clause 11 was agreed to, the following words being added to the end of the clause:—"Provided that no person having a six-day licence shall sell any intoxicating liquors on Sunday to any person whatever not lodging in his house."

Clauses 12 and 13 were agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 29 were agreed to.

Clause 30 (temporary continuance of licences forfeited without disqualification of premises) was, after a few words from Lord ABERDARE, struck out.

Clauses 31 and 32 were agreed to.

Clauses 33 and 34 were agreed to. On the question of adopting the schedule, which defines the metropolitan district as the city of London, or any place subject to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Board of Works, or within four miles of Charing cross, Earl BEAUCHAMP proposed to meet the cases of parishes which might hereafter be brought within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Board of Works by inserting the words "at the time being." If ever West Ham came under the jurisdiction of the Board of Works it would then be considered within the metropolitan district. The amendment was agreed to, the schedule was also agreed to, and the Bill passed through committee.

Apothecaries Act Amendment Bill.—This Bill was read a third time.

Alkali Act (1863) *Amendment Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time.

July 9.—*Factories* (*Health of Women, &c.*) *Bill.*—This Bill was read a second time.

The Personation Bill.—This Bill was read a second time.

Building Societies Bill.—This Bill passed through committee.

Civil Bill Courts (*Ireland*) *Bill.*—This Bill was read a second time.

The Leases and Sales of Settled Estates Bill.—This Bill was read a third time.

The Bills of Sale Amendment Bill.—This Bill was read a third time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

July 3.—*Intoxicating Liquors* (*Ireland*) (*No. 2*) *Bill.*—The consideration of this Bill in committee was resumed, and all the clauses were ultimately agreed to.

Some new clauses were, at the instance of the Government, added to the Bill.

Several clauses proposed by hon. members were negatived or withdrawn, and at the evening sitting the Bill passed through committee.

Hosiery Manufacture (*Wages*) *Bill.*—This Bill passed through committee.

Hertford College, Oxford, Bill.—This Bill passed through committee.

Industrial and Reformatory Schools.—Mr. CROSS introduced a Bill to extend the powers of prison authorities in relation to industrial and reformatory schools and for other purposes.

July 6.—*Welsh Interpreters.*—Mr. SCOURFIELD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he would direct inquiries to be made if any improvement could be effected in the means of securing competent interpreters in the different courts of justice in Wales where the Welsh language is generally spoken.—Mr. CROSS said he would communicate with the county court judges on the subject.

Poor Law Amendment Bill.—This Bill was read a second time.

Rating Bill.—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hertford College, Oxford, Bill.—This Bill as amended was considered.

Constabulary, Ireland.—Sir M. HICKS BEACH brought in a Bill to amend the laws relating to the Royal Irish Constabulary and the police of the police district of the Dublin metropolis.

July 7.—*Land Titles and Transfer Bill.*—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said that upwards of 200 years ago, in consequence of the then depreciation in the value of land, a committee was appointed by the other House for the purpose of investigating the tenure of land. That committee made its report in 1669, and recommended the adoption of a system of registration. He then traced the steps which had been taken during the last twenty years, in the way of inquiry into the subject, referring in detail to the recommendations of the commission to consider the defects in the working of Lord Westbury's Act. In the Bill now before the House an attempt was made to give effect to those recommendations. While mentioning the strong recommendations with which the Bill came before the House, he (the Attorney-General) must not be understood as deprecating criticism. On the contrary, he cordially invited it, and would give his best attention to any suggestions that might be made. Under the present measure it was proposed to make provision for the registration of titles of three kinds—first, titles that were marketable or indefeasible in the strict sense; secondly, titles that were marketable or indefeasible for a period less than the time hitherto recognized; and, thirdly, possessory titles. As to the period for which it was necessary that an indefeasible title should have lasted, it was proposed to reduce it from sixty to forty years, and it was further intended that it should not be essential to fix the boundaries before the registration. The Bill proposed to deal with the following interests in land:—First, fee simple titles; secondly, leasehold titles having a certain number of years to run; and, thirdly, charges upon estates, including mortgages. For the present it was intended to make use of the existing registry, but no doubt it would eventually become necessary to establish a number of district registries throughout the country. Another subject on which there had been considerable controversy out of doors was the compulsory registration of title. He believed it was pretty well known that this Bill proposed to make the registration of title compulsory upon the sale of any property, except in the case of a sale of property the value of which did not exceed £300. One of the great advantages of registration under this Bill would be that a conveyance or a mortgage might be made in a short form set out in a schedule to the Bill. After referring to the Real Property (Vendors and Purchasers) Bill and the Limitation Bill, he concluded by moving that the Land Titles and Transfer Bill be read a second time.—Sir F. GOLDSMID said that if it was regarded as presumptuous to criticize the Lord Chancellor's measure, his excuse was that he had equally high authority on his side—namely, the Lord Chancellor himself. The addition to the 27th clause, made on the third reading in the House of Lords, of a direction that compulsory registration should not apply to estates sold at a price not exceeding £300, could only signify that the new method of making out titles would be more expensive than the old. If the commissioners appointed in 1870 to inquire into this subject had been unanimous the recommendations of the commission might have deserved much weight. But of the twelve, one (Lord Westbury) seemed to have taken no part in the report, two declined to sign it, three signed it without reserve, and the remaining six put against their signatures asterisks referring to papers of dissent, which to a considerable extent nullified their signatures. He would refer, besides, to the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, comprising many of the most eminent London solicitors. They were convinced that the Bill would be useless, but had not the courage to act on their opinion and to recommend that it should not be passed. Their plan of trying an experiment which they were convinced would fail might be admissible if it would only do no good, but in his belief it would be mischievous. The Bill, whether with or without the 27th clause, would leave for an indefinite period two systems of land titles and transfer to go on side by side. The idea of those who proposed registration was that, perhaps without, but, certainly with, a solicitor's aid, the purchaser might by merely looking at the register at once ascertain whether the vendor could give him a perfectly clear title to the land contracted for. Let any one still entertaining such romantic notions read the 30th section of the present Bill, where he would find interests and charges which need not be put on the register, and to which the land might be subject, though the register looked perfectly clear, arranged under nine heads. The Bill was put before the House as one likely to simplify matters, but he believed that the clause separating titles to minerals and to the surface would have a contrary effect. The 13th clause, which prevented the register from being conclusive as to boundaries, was probably necessary, but such a provision had been declared by Sir Robert Torrens to be certain to make a register useless. He would next refer to the strange way in which, as it seemed to him, settlements were dealt with. In order to simplify titles, it was proposed that successive interests, such as those of tenant for life, or in tail, were not to appear on the register, but were to be reduced to equitable estates. One or more person or persons were to be registered as proprietor or proprietors in fee simple who might dispose of the settled property, leaving the equitable owners nothing but a money claim against him or them. These provisions appeared to be founded on a theory that settlements were the main cause of the complication of titles. His impression was that settlements were a less prolific source of complication than the multiplication of incumbrances, and with the latter the present Bill made hardly any attempt, certainly no effective attempt, to deal. On the other hand, the security of persons interested under settlements would be most seriously impaired by the provisions to which he had referred. It would not be disputed that the interests of the persons entitled under settlements should not be needlessly endangered, and for this purpose it was essential that the person to be registered as proprietor should be the one most likely to be trustworthy; and he could not understand why a tenant for life was in this respect to be preferred to trustees having a power of sale. He next desired to say a few words as to proposed modes of effecting mortgages and charges, which were to be of three kinds. In the first place came mortgages where the mortgagee appears on the register as an absolute owner, and if the analogy of stock had been followed, no other mortgage of registered land would have been allowed. But the Bill proposed, besides, charges by deposit of land certificates (which were not to be registered) and registered charges. The mortgage by deposit of land certificate was analogous to the present equitable mortgage by deposit of title deeds, but it appeared to him to be entirely inconsistent with the principle of the Bill that the title to registered land was to appear on the register. The confusion likely to arise from this it was attempted to obviate by directing that on the registration of charges the land certificate was to be produced. But where the registrar consented to its non-production for reasons which proved to be false, most serious difficulties as to priority might arise. The report of the Royal Commission of 1870 had for the purpose of simplifying titles proposed that no charges should be registered. But the Bill followed the recommendation of a most able commissioner (the late Mr. Waley), that for the sake of convenience there should be a registration of charges. This was one evidence of the truth (too much lost sight of in considering questions of this kind) that the complication of titles arose not so much from the state of the law as from the complexity of transactions, and that the choice often lay between, on the one hand, allowing persons to deal as they pleased with their property, and so makes titles complicated, and, on the other hand, restricting dealings for the purpose of making titles simple. This Bill wavered between the two principles, and the result would be most unsatisfactory. He had thought that it might be interesting to the House to know how many different registered titles with respect to different interests in the same piece of land might arise under this Bill, which was to make the title to land so simple, and which for that purpose made so extensive a change in the law. They would be as follows:—Freehold in surface of land, freehold in minerals, freehold in rent, leasehold in surface of land, leasehold in minerals, leasehold in rent, any number of subleases in every one of the three before-mentioned particulars, estates by curtesy in every one of the before-named freehold interests, estate by dower in the same, and any number of registered charges on any of the before-mentioned interests. Besides all these registered titles affecting the same piece of land, there might be the unregistered charge by deposit of

land certificate. He had no doubt that a measure which, in attempting to remove old complexities, introduced so many new ones, could not succeed. And he moved—"That this House, while fully recognizing the importance of facilitating and cheapening the transfer of land, is of opinion that those objects would not be accomplished by the measure now proposed."—MR. JACKSON, in seconding the amendment, said that though he felt bound to oppose the Bill, he admitted that it contained a very great deal which was most excellent and desirable. The appropriate cure for the existing evil was that there should be found, or created if necessary, a person or persons who should have such an ownership as would enable them to convey the land to a purchaser without the concurrence of all the persons who up to this time had been obliged to be made parties to the conveyance. That was the first great principle to establish under a system of land transfer, and it was to be found in the present Bill; but that principle must be practically carried out by suitable machinery, and there it was that he felt bound to quarrel with the measure. He thought its machinery altogether inadequate. Bad as the present system was, if they put upon it a compulsory system obnoxious to the criticism of the hon. and learned member for Reading, they would really create a greater evil than the one they had cured. The Attorney-General took great credit for the fact that this Bill was based on the report of the commission of 1868, and he told the House that the compulsory clauses were, if not the essence of the Bill, at all events its greatest ornament. Now, he had carefully looked into the report of the commissioners, and not one of them had suggested that there should be any compulsion: on the contrary, their recommendations were entirely confined to something which should be tentative and experimental. Sir H. Cairns in 1859 brought in a Bill corresponding in many of its provisions with the Bill now under consideration, and, speaking of a registry of deeds, he said that the objections were so manifest that hardly any one at the present day would venture to propose it; that those objections were that, to be worth anything, the registry of deeds must be made compulsory, and it must be for the whole country. Moreover, he added, the cost would be very great, and he believed for this country we must have provision for registering a thousand deeds a day. In the same speech Sir H. Cairns said he was persuaded that a system without compulsion would be best adapted to the wants of the country. Again, when Lord Selborne proposed the Bill of 1873, the present Lord Chancellor said he did not think it would be well to impose registration upon landlords as a matter of compulsion, and he was therefore surprised at the entire change which the views of the noble and learned lord on the subject appeared to have undergone. He was, he might add, expressing the opinions of a great number in the profession when he said that compulsion would have the effect which had been predicted by Lord Cairns—that it would cause great expense and would not facilitate, but rather impede, the transfer of land.—Mr. MARTEN said that we had to deal with an existing system, and the practical difficulties which had to be met required that a register should be established which by its gradual operation would bring land so within its scope that it might be dealt with in the same way as stock or ships. He did not hesitate to express his confidence that if the Bill were to pass that result might, with regard to the great bulk of land, be attained in the course of a few years. Reference had been made to observations of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, but that Council had expressed a decided opinion that an efficient system of land transfer would be an invaluable boon to the country, and had therefore assented to the principle of the present Bill. It had been contended that section 36, which contained a list of charges and interests that were not to be incumbrances within the meaning of the Act, would lead to considerable difficulty; but the matters in question were such as were sure to be mentioned in the particulars of sale. With regard to the provision that a man registering land should not be considered to include mines and minerals in the property unless they were expressly mentioned, he was inclined to think that in these days, when mines and minerals were almost always the subject of separate dealings, the course proposed was the more convenient one. He earnestly hoped the House would assent to the second reading.—Mr. O. MORGAN said that for the last 200 years the idea of a perfect land registry had been a sort of philosopher's stone after which English conveyancers and real property lawyers had been searching in vain. The present measure provided for three different kinds, or rather degrees, of registration—viz., of absolute, of limited, and of possessory titles. As regards the first two kinds of registration, this Bill was simply a re-enactment of the Act of 1862, with only two important differences. One was that a forty years' should be sufficient instead of a sixty years' title; the other was that under this Bill the registrar was not required to ascertain boundaries. He quoted from a statement of the amount of solicitors' bills in different transactions to show that purchases were now completed at a cost of about one per cent. upon the purchase-money, while, in one instance he quoted, a purchaser who registered his title under the Act of 1862 was over two years in completing his purchase, expended a sum of about £1,000 in the course of the transaction, and in the end registered a title with a blot upon it. What was wanted was a cheap and expeditious system; but, instead of securing this, the present Bill bristled with clauses containing the germs of enormous expense, and was, in addition, full of complication. The Attorney-General seemed to think the expense of registering a possessory title would be next to nothing, but the various formalities which would have to be gone through in complying with the provisions of the Bill in regard to those titles would probably involve considerable expense, and certainly a great deal of delay. The Bill was neither permissive nor compulsory, but a sort of hybrid, which was neither one thing nor the other. We had now arrived at a period of the session when it was hardly respectful to the House to press it on.—Mr. GOLDNEY said he had looked into the Bill with the greatest care. The result, he regretted to have to add, was that he thought it would as it stood be practically unworkable; and more, that it would be hardly possible to put its provisions in a workable shape. The Bill merely provided that after going to considerable expense and trouble a *prima facie* title was to be obtained—a title which it would be open to every one to attack. Now its provisions were founded partly on the Act of Lord Westbury and partly on the Australian Acts; but the good portions of the latter Acts, which worked very successfully in Victoria because of the admirable system of registration, though not so well in the other colonies, were, so far as he could see, omitted from it.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND said his only doubt in reference to the Bill was as to whether it went far enough, and whether it ought not to go the length of providing that absolute finality and indefeasibility which was afforded by the Irish system.—Mr. LAW said that with regard to the provisions to compel registration, it seemed to him that they were not sufficiently stringent. In order that the Bill might work efficiently it would be necessary that some machinery should be provided similar to the Landed Estates Court, which had worked very satisfactorily in Ireland.—After observations by Mr. STAVELEY HILL and Sir G. BOWYER, Sir J. KARSLAKE regarded the Bill as experimental, because, knowing as he did, that for forty years past, at least, the wisest of the lawyers had been trying to make a perfect system of registration, they certainly had not up to the present moment succeeded. He sincerely trusted it would be found necessary to extend district registries to the country; and if that step were taken a great part of the objection which now existed to compulsory registration would at once be got rid of. Another question was whether the Bill should be made compulsory. The compulsion in this case was of the mildest description. Although it might very properly be considered in committee, he did not think the Lord Chancellor could fairly be twitted upon that score.—Sir H. JAMES believed that the Bill would sadly disappoint the hopes of many who anticipated that it would simplify the title and facilitate the transfer of land. He feared that this Bill would do nothing in the present to simplify the transfer of land, and it was doubtful whether it would do anything in the future. It might be divided into two parts—the voluntary and compulsory. So far as it was voluntary, it seem likely to share the fate of Lord Westbury's Bill of 1862. The only advantage of this Bill was that registration marked the point of time from which the Statute of Limitations ran, and made it start from a certain instead of a doubtful time. An owner

would, however, be unwilling to make it patent to the world that he required a good marketable title. The compulsory portion of the Bill was good, yet it was threatened with the opposition of those who disliked compulsory registration. He trusted the Attorney General would not yield that portion of the Bill.—Colonel CORBETT said he believed the landed proprietors always trusted to the honourable conduct of the solicitors of this country. He did not think landed proprietors had clamoured for this Bill, or cared much about it one way or another; but, for himself, he should be glad to see a recurrence to small deeds.—Mr. RATHBONE opposed the abandonment of the compulsory clauses of the Bill.—Sir W. HARCOURT said the system of land transfer in this country was in a state about as disgraceful as it was possible to conceive. He held that no attempt to simplify the land system would be effectual unless we began by simplifying tenure and title. The root of the evil was the complication of the tenure of land. The Bill did not go half far enough. It would be good for this country if an encumbered estates court were set up in it like the court under that name which had been set up in Ireland. The fault of this Bill was not that it was too compulsory, but that it was not half compulsory enough. If the registration of land titles would be an advantage to the public generally, why, as had been pointed out, should at least two-thirds of the land of England be exempted from registration by this Bill? If registration was good, why should not it apply to that large class of land which was held in settlement and to land held in mortmain? Above all, why should estates under £300 be exempted from registration?—Mr. WHITWELL supported the measure.—Mr. Serjeant SHERLOCK accepted the Bill as one that was calculated to simplify the law of real property.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL remarked that in moving the second reading of the Bill he had invited criticism, and that his invitation had been very largely responded to. Much, however, that had fallen from hon. members was worthy of the careful consideration of the Government when the Bill got into committee. It was a mistake to suppose that properties of less value than £300 would not come within the operation of the Bill; they would not be brought within its operation compulsorily, but the owners of such properties would be quite free to avail themselves of its provisions.—Sir F. GOLDSMID having withdrawn his amendment, the Bill was read a second time.

The *Real Property* (*Vendors and Purchasers*) *Bill*.—This Bill was read a second time.

The *Real Property* (*Limitation*) *Bill*.—This Bill was also read a second time.

The three Bills were committed for Thursday week.

The *Supreme Court of Judicature Act* (1873) *Amendment Bill*.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved the second reading of this Bill.—Sir G. BOWYER said he would not move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months on the understanding that an opportunity of discussing the measure would be given on going into committee.—The Bill was read a second time, and the committee fixed for Friday.

The *Court of Judicature* (*Ireland*) *Bill*.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said that it had precisely the same object as the English Bill on the same subject. After describing the provisions of the Bill, he said he was not so wedded to particular provisions of the Bill as to refuse to consider any suggestions that might be made, but matters of detail could be best dealt with in committee.—Mr. LAW thought a judicious course had been taken in adopting the language of the English Bill as far as possible. He feared, however, that the Chancery division of the Bill was very weak, and thought that the constitution of the Court of Appeal might be made stronger with advantage.—Sir C. O'LOGHLEN regretted that the number of common law judges was about to be reduced.—After some discussion the Bill was read a second time.

Commissioners of Works and Public Buildings Bill.—This Bill was read a second time.

Slaughterhouses, &c., Bill.—This Bill went through committee.

Industrial and Reformatory Schools Bill.—This Bill was read a second time.

Hosiery Manufacture (*Wages*) *Bill*.—This Bill was read a third time.

Hertford College (*Oxford*) *Bill*.—This Bill was read a third time.

July 8.—*Legal Practitioners Bill*.—Mr. CHARLEY, in moving the second reading of this Bill, explained its object and the nature of its provisions. It would assimilate the law for the conviction of unqualified legal practitioners to the law, which had been sixteen years in operation, against unqualified medical practitioners. The 3rd clause provided a simple remedy for enforcing the existing law for the protection of the public and the profession against unqualified conveyancers; and the last clause had for its object the protecting of persons in distressed circumstances from being induced to give bills of sale, by which their property could be carried off to money lenders, without knowing the effect of those instruments. After referring to the Acts respecting unqualified persons acting as attorneys and solicitors, the hon. member pointed out that whereas the remedy provided by those Acts was confined to the case of unqualified attorneys and solicitors acting in some court, the present Bill was so framed as to include unqualified attorneys and solicitors, acting generally as such, and not merely in some court. He maintained that the worst part of the practices of such persons were carried on out of court. He asserted that "sham" attorneys acquired immense influence over timid or ignorant persons, whom they managed to entrap into a correspondence with them by threatening to institute legal proceedings against their goods and their persons. In illustration of this he quoted the threatening circulars issued by certain "societies," frequently consisting of two or three persons, who sometimes very cautiously withheld their addresses. He also referred to the mode in which unqualified legal agents insinuated themselves into the good graces of unfortunate persons who had judgments and bills of sale registered against them. They were in the habit of sending a circular to the debtor in such a position, hinting that such things frequently were forerunners of bankruptcy; and that if he should happen to be proceeded against by his creditors he would do well to favour the writer with a personal interview or avail himself of his services. With regard to conveyances, it sometimes happened that persons made large fortunes by drawing them, without having any of the necessary qualifications; and the public had no guarantee that important documents executed in the most serious moments of life were prepared by persons having the slightest acquaintance with the subject. By the 3rd clause of the present Bill the unqualified person was made liable to an action for a specified amount in the county court, and this provision would, without entailing much expense, afford a real security to the public.—The SOLICITOR-GENERAL, while objecting strongly to certain parts of the Bill, did not mean to oppose the second reading. In so far as this Bill afforded a simple means of proceeding against a man who had been guilty of holding himself out as qualified to do work for which he was not qualified, its provisions, subject to some alterations in the language, would be found very useful; but clause 3 would unduly and unnecessarily interfere with the liberty of the subject, inasmuch as it would forbid a man to exercise his own choice as to the person whom he should employ to transact his private business. Moreover, it would sometimes have the effect of preventing the employment of the very man best qualified for the particular work—as, for example, an accountant, when documents connected with a bankruptcy had to be drawn up; or an auctioneer, when the matter related to the sale of property. Why should the accountant or the auctioneer, in such a case, be made liable practically to a penalty of £10—the amount for which it was proposed he should be liable to be sued in the county court—and be unable to recover any remuneration for his work? As to bills of sale, referred to in the 4th clause, there was a provision, which would probably be found to deal adequately with the subject, in a Bill at present before the House of Lords.—Mr. C. LEWIS spoke in favour of the Bill. The Bill was read a second time.

International Copyright.—Mr. BOURKE brought in a Bill to amend the law relating to international copyright.

July 9.—*The New Law Courts*.—Mr. FRESHFIELD asked the First Commissioner of Works whether any space had been reserved or provision made in the new Law Courts

for the Court of Final Appeal, and what arrangement was proposed to be adopted for supplying such Court, and where.—Lord H. Lennox said his attention had been called to the question of providing accommodation in the new Courts of Justice for the Final Court of Appeal; and he hoped his hon. friend would not deem him discourteous if he refrained at present from entering into any detailed answer on that subject.

Public Worship Regulation Bill.—Mr. Russell Gurney moved the second reading of this Bill. After a long discussion the debate was adjourned.

The Revising Barristers' Payment Bill.—This Bill passed through Committee.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

LEGAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

A general meeting of this association was held, by the permission of the Benchers of the Middle Temple, in the Middle Temple Hall on Wednesday, the 8th inst.

On the motion of Sir George Bowyer, M.P., Lord Selborne took the chair. There was an influential attendance.

The Chairman, in moving the adoption of the report which had previously been circulated, briefly referred to the circumstances which had led to his resignation of the office of President, on being made Lord Chancellor, and to Mr. Baron Amphlett having likewise felt it incumbent upon him to resign that office on being promoted to the bench. He said it was not without some hesitation that he had acceded to the proposal to resume the office of President, especially looking to the possibility that under the Judicature Act he might be called upon again to take part in judicial duties. However, he had felt that, subject to those reserves and limitations which would be proper in the case of a person filling any public duties which might possibly under some circumstances require an independent view to be taken of matters in which the association felt an interest, if they were willing to accept his services upon those terms he should be most happy to place himself entirely at their command. With respect to the business of the meeting he did not think that an occasion on which it was necessary or convenient to go over the old ground, and endeavour to demonstrate once more the need for an improved system of education which would be obtained by the establishment of a general school of law upon the principles which they had always advocated. He looked upon those principles as either established by common consent, or established in the judgment of all members of the association. The leading principles were these—first of all, that legal education should be conducted upon a footing of public authority and public responsibility, under the safeguards and guarantees of public regulations; secondly, that it should be conducted upon comprehensive principles so as to extend to those who purposed to belong to either branch of the legal profession, and not to those only, but to all her Majesty's subjects who might be willing to take advantage of it; and, lastly, that the organisation of the governing body of the new school should be such as not to give an undue preponderance of power to any particular branch of the legal profession, and such as should ensure impartiality and fairness in the examinations. Those were the leading principles which in that association were not likely to be called in question or departed from. The general object was to improve the course of instruction and education in the law, to extend it, and place it upon a more scientific basis, and there could not be one more worthy of the great and important interests of this country, and of its place among the nations of the civilised world, but that which was the fundamental and leading object of all was a matter as to which he was happy to say they had no monopoly of the principle, because he believed it to be admitted, although there might be different views as to the manner of giving effect to it, by all intelligent persons who had paid attention to the subject. No one would now contend that in times past sufficient provision had been made for those objects, and he much doubted whether many would be found to contend that what had recently been done by others towards the improvement of such aids to legal education as now existed was sufficient for the purpose. What was the present position of the question with respect to what had already been attempted or done? When on two occasions it had been his duty to call the attention of the House of Commons to this subject, his invitation to the Government to deal with it was met and put aside, not by arguments going to the real substance of the question, but by those of a dilatory kind; things were not considered to be ripe; Government was not ready to undertake the subject; more time and more opportunity was desired for those learned bodies who were interested in it to consider what they could do, and to bring their plans to a greater degree of maturity. It was impossible not to feel that such a mode of meeting the question had much to be said for it, and they could not but be willing to wait if there was a chance of getting greater light and greater assistance from the judgment of others in any reasonable interval which might elapse. Great questions of this kind were not to be pressed forward with precipitation or impatience, but on the other hand they must not be allowed to go to sleep when attention had been once called to them. Now, what had been done? He had always been ready to acknowledge the efforts made by the Inns of Court to improve legal education and the liberality with which they had contributed towards it, and had never scrupled to express his confident belief that the time would come when they should all be cordially united upon principles common to that association; but such bodies did not move very rapidly in the direction of change, and it was common to human nature everywhere to admit others rather unwillingly to any share or participation in power which they might happen to enjoy. It was, therefore, not wonderful that the Inns of Court should have hitherto rather declined the overtures made to them for co-operation by the association, and endeavoured to proceed on their own independent lines. But what had hitherto been the result of that mode of proceeding? What had been gained and what had not been gained? In the first place, and it was no inconsiderable matter, on two points at least the principles which the association originally contended for, and which might not have obtained recognition but for that contention, had now been admitted by the Inns of Court, and one of those principles was not only admitted by abstract resolution, but was carried into effect in the most practical manner—namely, the principle that, as had long been the case with solicitors, so with those who were to be called to the bar, none should be admitted to the privileges and responsibilities of that honourable profession without first proving his fitness by passing a compulsory examination. The second point he could not speak of in the same manner. Practically nothing had been gained but the admission of the principle. The Inns of Court had consented that those who were not students or members of the Inns might be admitted to the benefit of the instruction given by the professors and lecturers of the Inns of Court, and though, according to the returns for the year ending last Christmas, it would appear that the practical fruit of that liberality had hitherto been that two gentleman only had taken advantage of the opportunity offered to them, still he felt confident in his own mind that were a system of public legal education established, it would be attended by a very considerable number of those who had not the practice of any branch of the profession in view, and still more by a considerable number of those who, though intending to practise the profession, did not contemplate being called to the bar. Still, notwithstanding the minuteness of the result, he attributed a considerable value to the principle of that concession. Nothing was more frequently objected to the plans which they had advocated than the alarm which some most excellent persons appeared to entertain lest some extraordinary invasion of the lines and landmarks which divided the different branches of the profession should follow from admitting into the same class and lecture room those who might contemplate practising as attorneys and solicitors, as well as those who might aim at being called to the bar; but the moment the Inns of Court admitted any gentlemen paying the moderate fee required for attending the public lectures and classes, it was manifest the principle of that objection was given up, and it was no longer necessary to discuss that as a matter of principle. He could not but believe that it would have to be looked at in this practical

point of view, that if no one found it worth his while to come, then no harm could be done; but if they did find it worth their while to come, every one in the result would, he was sure, rejoice that the benefits of that sound instruction which was offered to students for the bar were also accessible to all others who were willing to receive it. He could not doubt that those benefits would be great, and probably not the least of them would be the diminution of any idea, so far as it might exist, of a social line of demarcation between the two branches of the profession. Now, turning to the other side of the question, to see in what respects that which had been done by the Inns of Court fell short of that which was required, it appeared to him to do so with respect to the principles on which the association was founded. At present they had not attained to any public authority or public responsibility, but the strange anomalous *quasi* private character of the Inns of Court was entirely maintained. Regulations were put forward from time to time by them entirely according to their own pleasure, and although the principle of comprehension had been admitted, its practice would never follow under regulations so narrow and crude as those now in existence. It was pointed out in the report for the previous year, and the observation was now repeated, that the experience of one year had doubtless shown that the provisions made by those learned bodies, of whom he hoped they should always speak with the highest respect, was entirely inadequate, and must have prepared them for the next step which sooner or later it would be necessary to take. He could not but recall to the mind of his audience the very able criticism upon the last revised scheme of the Inns of Court, which was contained in the report for the previous year. That report stated at page 11 that under the new scheme the confessedly inadequate provision for professorial teaching at present afforded was actually reduced, the professor of jurisprudence not only undertaking the important departments of the Roman civil law and international law, public and private, but having also to undertake the duties of professor of constitutional law and legal history, which had before been entrusted to a separate reader. That passage certainly received a remarkable illustration from the experience of the past year. The gentleman on whose shoulders all this burden had been thrown—and no doubt they were as strong as any which could be found—was Professor Sheldon Amos, who was probably as capable of undertaking the burden, and was certainly as willing as any other gentleman now engaged in legal education; but he found that whereas, in the previous year, there had been, in jurisprudence and civil and international law, only eighteen lectures, in the year 1873 on those subjects and in the Roman civil law no less than thirty-one public lectures were given—a fact which certainly spoke in very encouraging terms of the interest taken by the students in those branches of study as well as of the efficiency with which they were taught. But, turning to the department of constitutional law and legal history which had been added to Professor Amos's duties, it would be found that he had been unable to give more than six lectures in those subjects, though eighteen had been given when a separate professor was appointed. While not prepared to say that there might not be a gain upon the whole, the gain was, at all events, not in that particular department of knowledge which was added to the already sufficient labours of that eminent teacher. But with regard to some other points, he found that in the last year for which returns were issued, as compared with the previous year, there was a very considerable falling off, both in the number of students and in the average attendance at the public lectures. These did not appear to be satisfactory results; and without at all undertaking to say that it was impossible that explanations might be afforded which would show that any conclusions drawn from them were not conclusive as to the matter now in hand, he could not but think that if the scheme of the association were carried into effect upon sound principles and in an energetic manner they might confidently look for much greater results, and results which, he ventured to think, would show an increase from year to year. It was always invidious to criticise adversely things which were well intended, and in many respects generously done, but he must say that he thought the leading bias, the endeavour to give too narrow and exclusively professional a character to the education afforded by the Inns of Court, showed itself in many ways in the regulations under which it was afforded. The system was kept in leading strings, and a system so kept never could be free from a certain cramped, narrow and feeble character which would prevent its fulfilling all the objects it ought to accomplish. First of all the professors were elected for three years only, unless re-appointed, and that re-appointment, so far from being put forward as a thing they had a right to expect, it was the rule at the end of every three years to publish advertisements inviting competitors for the office. How could they expect to obtain the best energies of the most competent men or to have studies directed on a large uniform, consistent and broad system, when a man was only appointed for three years, and with so precarious a chance of re appointment. The question of salary he would not dwell upon, and undoubtedly it was a thing which to be adequate must pre-suppose a certain amount of success, but he believed that under such a system as that association had aimed at the success would be sufficient to make it possible to appoint professors upon a tenure similar to that upon which professorships are held at the great universities, and with an adequate remuneration to induce them to give their best energies to the work. But the leading strings did not end there; in order to insure systematic instruction, the scheme of all the lectures was to be submitted to and approved by the Council, and even the examination papers, and the standard which the examiners required both for honours and for pass degrees, and the marks to be assigned for every paper in the examinations, were all to be submitted to the committee of education and examination for their approval. Under such a system there could be no independence either of the professors or of the examiners. There was another regulation about examinations which appeared to be dictated solely by the views which naturally resulted from the regulations of the Inns of Court as to the time during which dinners must be eaten before a gentleman could be called to the bar. It was provided that a student might pass in Roman law after four terms, but that he must not be examined in other subjects, however proficient he might be, until he had kept nine terms. He must say he thought it would be much easier to allow the student to be examined whenever he thought himself capable, at any rate not necessarily to postpone the examination for three years. Of course one consequence of the exclusive system of trying to keep education for the bar as far as possible in the hands of the Inns of Court alone was that the funds available for the purpose could be only those which the Inns of Court supplied, or which resulted from the attendance of those students who had in view a call to the bar. The funds obtained in the last year for which he had seen the published accounts, namely, 1872 (when there was a considerably larger attendance of new students than in the next year), amounted to £4,285, to which the Inns of Court contributed in addition £1,440, making a total of £5,725. He had also seen the accounts of the Incorporated Law Society with respect to their part of the work of education, and for the year 1873 he found that the funds received from all sources connected with their examinations, including the subscriptions of articled clerks to the classes and lectures, amounted to £4,034. He did not find that the law society had occasion to make any addition to these funds; on the contrary, they did not seem to have all been expended for the purpose of legal education, but surely if these two sources of income could, by the co-operation of these bodies, be made jointly available for the whole work, it would be very much better, and the efficiency of the teaching must be diminished by the division of two systems, which, of course, involved two sets of machinery instead of one. It appeared to him that if they could bring together the £9,000 or £10,000 received by both bodies they would obtain much better results for the money. The conclusion at which he arrived was that, so far from having got much nearer to the desired object than they were before, endeavours would be made by the Inns of Court to carry them further away from it. He must now state the result of his own efforts to push forward the question in those quarters in which it was desirable to move. Most present were doubtless aware that when he had the honour to fill the office of

Chancellor a deputation waited upon him, headed by Mr. Baron Amphlett, their then President, who, though recognising the obstacles which stood in the way of any action on his part in the previous year, thought the matter should not be allowed to sleep any longer, and he undertook, not for the Government, but for himself, to prepare a Bill or Bills upon the subject; and, believing that the late Government would be quietly in office for another session, to bring it forward if he could obtain the consent of his colleagues in the course of the session then anticipated. They also knew how those expectations had been disappointed, and that when a new Parliament was assembled he no longer was in a position to hold consultations with any Government. However, he prepared, as well as the difficult position of the question enabled him to do, a scheme or sketch of a Bill with the double object of carrying into effect what he thought was the spirit of the report of the Royal Commission of 1855 for the incorporation of the Inns of Court and the regulation of their affairs, the principle of which had also been assented to by a resolution of Lincoln's Inn some years ago on the motion of the present Lord Chancellor. Part of the Bill which he so prepared was addressed to that object, and the other part to incorporating a general school of law to be governed by a council, composed nearly in equal divisions of persons to be nominated by the Crown, and independent of parties in any branch of the legal profession; of persons to be nominated practically by the bar, and thirdly, of persons to be nominated by the solicitors, with some *ex officio* members. Without going into the details, he might say that he had endeavoured to make them conformable to the principles which had been approved by the association. The Bill was necessarily in the nature of a first draft, and being desirous of obtaining suggestions from all bodies concerned, he sent it in print confidentially to all her Majesty's judges, to the benchers and the four Inns of Court, to the Incorporated Law Society, and to the association. From the two latter bodies he was favoured as he expected, with useful criticisms and an encouraging expression of general approval and support. From the Inns of Court he was not fortunate enough to meet with a like encouragement. They appointed a joint committee, rather numerous, and the natural result was no criticism whatever on any provisions of the Bill, but simply this resolution,—"That this joint committee disapproves of the draft Bill sent to the Inns of Court by the late Lord Chancellor, and recommends that this resolution he communicated to the Lord Chancellor and Lord Selborne." It would easily be seen that the Bill in its totality might for one reason or other not be very likely to recommend itself to any one individual on the committee, and the resolution purported to have been passed unanimously. But with a resolution in such general terms there might be a good deal of diversity of opinion as to what could or could not advantageously be done; but still that was all the assistance he got from the Inns of Court. Gray's Inn and Lincoln's Inn communicated to him separately, the fact that they had adopted the resolution, but though he waited for a considerable time he received no communication at all from either of the Temples. Lincoln's Inn, however, did not think it proper simply to receive and adopt the report, but passed another resolution to this effect—"That the bench in adopting the report desire to express their willingness to consider any measure that may be deemed calculated to provide for the more thorough education and testing of candidates for the bar and to secure a more effectual discipline of the bar, and that this resolution be communicated to the other Inns of Court, and to the Lord Chancellor and Lord Selborne." It would be seen that they were very careful to avoid the introduction of anything but the bar into a measure which they might be asked to approve, but upon that subject they must judge for themselves. He should quite agree that if anything were proposed adverse to the more thorough education and testing of candidates for the bar, or to the effectual discipline of the bar, that would be a conclusive objection to it, but he hoped what might be proposed on liberal and comprehensive principles for the benefit, not only of all branches of the profession, and of persons contemplating joining either branch of it, but of all her Majesty's subjects, might be found not only consistent with the character of the bar, and of the sound education of candidates for it; but would in fact be the best means of promoting those objects. That being the position in which the matter at present stood, he had only one other thing to mention, which was connected in some degree with the delay that had taken place since the beginning of the year in moving further in the matter. One cause of delay he had already adverted to, viz., having to wait some time for the replies which he got, and also for those which he did not get. But in addition to that there was a difficulty of a practical kind affecting some of the provisions of the Bill, and of the scheme which had been communicated to the Council of the association, owing to the separation, until recently, of the profession of attorneys and solicitors into two societies, the Incorporated Law Society and the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association. This difficulty, however, had now been removed by the union of the two incorporated law societies in May last, and in this state of things he had thought it right to give notice that on Friday next he should bring the two subjects, of the constitution of the Inns of Court, and the general school of legal education, under the notice of the House of Lords, and submit two Bills upon those subjects. Looking to the small modicum of assistance in the way of suggestions which he had been favoured with by the Inns of Court, he had thought it wiser on the whole not to unite any longer that part of the scheme which related to them with the portion which related to legal education, especially as, in his view, each might be considered separately on its own merits. The Bills would be by no means identical in their provisions with the drafts which had been circulated, because he had endeavoured to profit by such of the suggestions made to him both by some of the judges and by that association, and the Incorporated Law Society as recommended themselves to his own judgment, and besides that, he had endeavoured to glean as far as possible by communication with some gentlemen who knew what had passed at the benches of the Inns of Court some information as to the principal objections entertained to the scheme which he had proposed. So far as those objections applied to the principles adopted by that association they must be met with a bold face and encountered, because they must not give up either the principle of comprehension or the principle of public authority and responsibility. But so far as it affected mere details and matters internal to the Inns of Court he was quite prepared to modify in several important respects the proposition which he had originally embodied in the first Bill. He would not enter into all the details of the subject which he should have to explain on Friday next in another place, but he might say that he was thoroughly in earnest in his desire to promote its objects, and he should be very thankful to all persons both there and in the country for any support which could be given him. He should be by no means impatient, and did not think of pressing these Bills during the present session even to a second reading, because he did not wish a premature expression of the opinion of the House to be obtained upon it, but rather desired that the Bills, when printed, should be circulated throughout the profession and throughout the country, confidently expecting that when Parliament met again he should then be in possession of any suggestions which might be requisite to enable him to present them in such a shape that the Bills might be pressed forward, and he certainly should not then be wanting in the endeavour to do so. But even then, if that endeavour should be for a time unsuccessful, it must be remembered that no great work was ever accomplished in a day, and that patience and perseverance were both necessary means, and in the end the certain and effectual means in this country for accomplishing every really useful and important public object.

Mr. Osborne Morgan, Q.C., M.P., in seconding the resolution, said he hailed the return of Lord Selborne to the presidential chair as an augury of success for the association in the future. After what had been somewhat euphemistically termed in the report "the course of events," it could not of course be expected that much progress should have been made with any Bill during the present session, and he certainly thought that in the present temper of the House of Commons Lord Selborne had exercised a wise discretion in not pressing

forward his measure at the present time. In the mean time they had had an opportunity of perusing his draft Bill, and subject to some matters of detail he believed it had commended itself to the general approbation of the association. He desired as a bencher of one of the Inns of Court to express his regret that the draft Bill should have met with so curt a reception at the hands of the joint committee, but he believed the course now adopted by Lord Selborne of separating the Bill into two parts would facilitate its passing. This great question of legal education had now ceased to be a lawyers', barristers', or a solicitors' question; it had become, as it ought to be, a national question, a question for the consideration of the whole community, and when public attention was drawn to it he believed all would be agreed that the law of England should be open to be studied by every one living under its protection.

Mr. W. FOWLER also briefly supported the resolution. He believed public attention was being directed to this matter, and that the questions would soon be asked—what the Inns of Court existed for, and what was done with the vast property they were supposed to possess. When in the House of Commons he listened to the questions put by Lord Selborne and to the replies given to him, and he must say that the latter appeared to him in the last degree unsatisfactory. Referring to the time when he received his call to the bar, he said he should have rejoiced had he had the opportunity of attending a course of lectures such as he hoped soon to see established.

Mr. MONTAGUE COOKSON said nothing could be more wise than the separation of this question into two parts, one dealing with the general school of law, and the other with the Inns of Court. Measures in this country required a considerable time before they worked their way into the public mind; they were generally misunderstood at first, and probably what they were now advocating was no exception. First, they were told that a legal university for conferring degrees was to be established; next, that there was to be a fusion of the two branches of the profession; next, that the disciplinary powers of the Inns of Court were to be interfered with; and lastly, that the privilege of the Incorporated Law Society as to putting the veto upon the admission of solicitors was to be destroyed. Further ventilation of the question, however, had resulted in this, that the public now understood that what was desired was a general school of law comprising a scheme into which both branches of the profession could be admitted unreservedly, and when this was thoroughly understood he believed it would meet with general support. From his own experience as a lecturer, appointed by the Incorporated Law Society, he was in a position to say that there was no reason why two professors should be engaged at the same time in delivering two sets of lectures on the same subject to two separate classes, one in Chancery-lane, and the other at Lincoln's Inn. It was simply an unnecessary expenditure of labour.

Mr. JANSON (President of the Incorporated Law Society) also expressed his hearty concurrence in the report.

Mr. FARRER said that though it was true that in that room it was unnecessary to argue for the principles which they desired to establish, the very fact of the way in which Lord Selborne's proposals were received showed that if any duty was incumbent upon them it was to press their principles upon the attention of all with whom they had any influence, especially those in either House of Parliament who might have the power of giving effect to their wishes. Nothing could be more fragmentary or incoherent than the way in which a young man was sent into a solicitor's office to learn his profession. Every one who had had experience at a good school or university would be aware of the great advantage it was for any student to have his reading wisely directed, and it was just this want that a school of law would meet. There was another point also of great practical importance, namely, that until a young man had been studying for some time he did not discover in what direction his peculiar talents lay, and there was no doubt that some were better fitted for the bar, and others specially qualified to pursue the profession of a solicitor. It should therefore be open a young man at the end of his career as a student to ...e to which branch of the profession he should ...elf; why should he be detained for another course of three years, if at the end of the first course he could satisfy the examiners that he was qualified for either branch?

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously.

Mr. MARTEN, Q.C., M.P., proposed the second resolution—"That Lord Selborne be elected President of the association, and that the other officers of the association be re-elected—namely, Mr. Justice Quain, chairman of the executive committee; Mr. Clabon, treasurer; Messrs. Jevons, Longbourne, Palmer, and Williams, honorary secretaries." In doing so, he congratulated the noble chairman on his proposal to bring forward the two Bills in the House of Lords next Friday, and expressed a hope that the matter would be very well discussed and ventilated throughout the country. They could not expect the Inns of Court or any similar bodies to suddenly adopt any new scheme, or that the country would at once appreciate it in its fullest extent. With regard to the falling off of students at the lectures which had been referred to, he thought it might be accounted for in some degree, at any rate, by the attention which was now paid to legal studies in the universities, in consequence of which many young men prepared themselves at Oxford or Cambridge before coming to London to read for the bar. He quoted from a speech delivered by Mr. Arthur Wilson, tutor in common law at the Inner Temple (17 S. J. 234), to show that there was an increased demand for legal teaching, thus proving that where provision was made for legal education it was appreciated, and would, no doubt, be made available by a considerable number of persons. It was of the highest importance that gentlemen who might be called upon to discharge the duties of magistrates and other public offices should receive some instruction in the principles of the law.

Mr. JACKSON, Q.C., seconded the resolution, which was put and carried unanimously.

Professor SHELDON AMOS proposed a vote of thanks to the benchers of the Middle Temple for their kindness in allowing the meeting to be held in the Middle Temple Hall. In so doing he desired to express his decided opinion, founded upon considerable experience, that when a large number of students were collected in one class, the lecturer felt greater freedom in dealing with his subject, and from coming in contact with different minds was able to treat it more satisfactorily than when his classes were small and divided.

Mr. WESTLAKE, Q.C., seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

The proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the chairman, proposed by Mr. West, Q.C.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the society was held on Tuesday evening last at the Law Institution. The committee's annual report was read, by which it appeared that the session had comprised thirty-one meetings, that thirty-eight new members had been elected, and that, after deducting resignations, there were on the roll 200 members. The treasurer's annual account showed the finances of the society to be in a very flourishing condition. The election of officers for the ensuing year resulted in the re-election of all the outgoing officers—viz.: treasurer, Mr. E. P. Rouse; secretary, Mr. T. W. Ratcliff; committee, Messrs. Hargreaves, Byrne, Gibb, Nicholls, and Indermaur; auditors, Messrs. Austin and Gordon. The society adjourned till the 27th October next. The annual dinner will take place on the 14th inst.

A petition was presented on Monday evening by Mr. Sykes, from solicitors of Bridlington and Bridlington Quay, against the Land Transfer Bill; and on Tuesday evening a petition from the Law Amendment Society was presented in favour of the Bill.

At the Warwickshire Assizes on Tuesday Mr. Justice Denman, in charging the grand jury, referring to drink as a prolific source of crime, mentioned as an illustration of this that there were thirty-nine prisoners for trial at the last Liverpool Assizes, one-third being cases of murder, manslaughter, and unlawful wounding, every one of which was directly attributable to drink.

LEGAL ITEMS.

Mr. Ambrose, Q.C., was inadvertently described last week as of the Home instead of the Northern Circuit.

The *Albany Law Journal* announces that Mr. Justice Doe, of the Supreme Court of New Hampshire, having written an opinion in a "partnership case," covering 284 pages, is engaged in cutting it down.

In a case heard last week before the judge of the Leeds County Court, his Honour adjourned his decision in order that he might ask the Leeds Chamber of Commerce certain questions with reference to the custom of merchants.

Hon. Luther S. Dixon, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, has resigned. He has held the office for fifteen years, and resigns it now to return to the practice of law, which he expects to find much more lucrative.

The London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* affirms that the amount spent on elections and petitions tried or lodged for the two divisions of the county of Durham since the general election is reported to amount to more than £100,000.

Sir John Eardley Eardley-Wilmot has resigned the recordership of Warwick, which he has held for about twenty years. Sir John's resignation on Friday, says the *Times*, caused some surprise when announced at the Quarter Sessions, which had consequently to be adjourned until Monday.

It is announced that the Masters of the Bench of the Inner Temple have appointed Mr. E. M. Barry, R.A., to act as their architect in respect of new buildings which they are about to erect at the southern end of Harcourt-buildings, facing the Thames Embankment. Similar buildings are projected by the Middle Temple Benchers, in accordance with an agreement between the two societies.

A return, says the *Times*, has been published by the Secretary of the Estate Exchange of the landed estates and other property registered as sold by public auction and by private contract for the half-year ending 30th of June and compared with the same period of the three preceding years. The table is short but significant. In 1871 the amount for the half-year was £1,903,180, for 1872 it was £3,775,080, for 1873 it was £4,784,857, and for 1874 it was £4,873,313

A deputation from the Council of the Social Science Association waited upon the Earl of Derby on Tuesday to present a memorial to his Lordship urging the necessity of providing better security for the property of British subjects in foreign countries than at present exists. Mr. E. Jenkins, M.P., introduced the deputation, and made some observations on the present unsatisfactory state of the law, and was followed by Mr. T. Webster, Q.C., F.R.S., and Mr. H. D. Jencken. His Lordship, having admitted the great importance of the subject, promised to give it his best attention.

The following are the special questions appointed for discussion at the Glasgow meeting of the Social Science Congress.—Jurisprudence and Amendment of the Law Department.—International and Municipal Law Section.—1. "Is it desirable that the verdicts of juries should be unanimous?" 2. "Should the testimony of any and what persons, at present excluded witnesses, be admissible as evidence in courts of law?" 3. "How far may courts of arbitration be resorted to as a means of settling the disputes of nations?" —Repression of Crime Section.—1. "How far is it desirable that the Industrial Schools Act should be extended to day industrial feeding schools?" 2. "How far should previous convictions be taken into account in sentencing criminals?" 3. "Is it desirable to extend sentences of police supervision to other cases than those already provided for?"

At the St. Helens County Court on Tuesday, Mr. M'Nab, solicitor, made an application to the judge (Mr. Collier) under novel circumstances. At a recent sitting Mr. Slator, of Rainhill, obtained a verdict against the Altrincham Local Board for the price of a horse sold to the latter. His Honour then granted an appeal against his decision. The rules of the county courts require that security for the costs shall be lodged within ten days of the decision, and the case signed by the judge within twelve days; but the Borough Funds Act precludes local boards from complying with the regulations within the specified time, and the application to the court was now made with a view of gaining such an extension of the period as the Borough Funds Act renders necessary. His Honour said it was a novel point, demanding consideration, and he promised to consult the registrar at Liverpool on the subject; and in the meantime he granted an order staying the plaintiff from execution.

At the opening of the Salford Quarter Sessions on Monday, the Chairman, Mr. Higgin, Q.C., observed to the grand jury that many gentlemen who took an active part in the administration of justice were of opinion that magistrates ought to be armed with authority to administer flogging to persons who were guilty of brutal kicking, especially upon women; and no doubt, if magistrates were armed with a power of that kind, it would tend speedily to put down the offence; but it was extremely questionable, at least to him, whether the Government would entrust the infliction of the cat-o-nine-tails to magistrates sitting in petty sessions. It seemed to him that the magistrates, upon consideration, would probably think that it would be their duty to alter their course of conduct in reference to these cases, and, instead of dealing with them summarily, commit the offenders for trial at the Quarter Sessions, where they could be indicted and punished much more severely than they could otherwise be.

The *New York World* says:—"James F. Babcock, judge of the City Court, this morning entered the court-room and began the business of the session in apparently good health. At the adjournment of the court, and as he was about to leave the bench, he was attacked with paralysis, which was succeeded by fits of apoplexy, from the effects of which he died. Mr. Babcock has been well and favourably known in the State for forty years. A man of learning and influence, he exerted his energies always for the good of those about him. He was born in this city in 1810, and learned the trade of a printer. In 1830 he became editor of the *Palladium*, and continued in its interest till 1861, when he was appointed by President Lincoln Collector of the Port of New Haven, holding the position eight years. In 1869 Mr. Babcock began the study of law, became a member of the bar, and early in the present session of the Legislature was elected judge of the City Court, taking his seat on the 1st of June. His sudden decease may be considered the direct result of overwork."

An evening newspaper publishes the following statistics furnished by Mr. Stonor, the judge of the county courts included in circuit 45, showing, by a comparison of the number of imprisonments for debt, with the number of judgment summonses issued, the working of the present law. Circuit No. 45 (1873).—Judgment summonses issued, 2,286; judgment summonses heard, 1,063; orders for commitment, 735; warrants of arrest issued, 417; persons arrested, 306; paid on arrest, 216; persons imprisoned, 90; paid during imprisonment, 20. From these figures it will be seen, first, that while the judge is armed as he is at present with powers of commitment, the mere issue of a judgment summons has been sufficient to extort payment from more than one-half of the debtors—1,223 out of 2,286, who up to that time were withholding it; next, that of the 735, against whom (their ability to pay their debts having been made out to the satisfaction of the judge) orders of commitment were made, no fewer than 218 must have paid to avert further proceedings; next, that of the 417, against whom warrants of arrest were issued, 109 must have paid to avoid imprisonment; next, that of the 306 arrested, 216 paid to obtain their immediate release; and lastly, that of the 90, who actually submitted to imprisonment, 20 paid in order to obtain their release before their term of detention expired. In other words, out of 735 debtors able to pay their debts, but refusing to do so, all but 70, or nine-tenths, have been compelled to pay by the operation of the law of imprisonment for debt.

At the Auction Mart on Wednesday last the sale of a very unique property was effected by Messrs. Edwin Fox & Bousfield. It consisted of 274 London Bridge Waterworks Annuities secured by the New River Company, each producing £2 10s. per annum, for a term of 208 years. The average price was £58 each annuity, the total amount of sale being £16,020. The London Bridge Waterworks were constructed in the year 1580 by a Dutchman, who secured a lease from the Corporation of London for 500 years, prior to which time the City had been supplied by fountains and wells, or from the banks of the river. These works were considerably enlarged in 1701, when engines were erected in the Thames, water wheels having previously been used, and two years later a company or co-partnership was formed, the duty of supplying the metropolis having previously been in the hands of representatives of the original promoter.

Subsequently the flow of the Thames was seriously impeded, and the navigation through the central arch endangered, by the blocking-up of the other arches, and it was then arranged between the Corporation of the city of London and the London Bridge Waterworks Proprietors that their works should be removed and the district served with water from the Thames, supplied henceforth by the New River Company, who undertook to pay the proprietors their then dividend of £2 10s. per share, as an annuity for the 260 years unexpired in the original lease. An Act of Parliament was obtained in 1822 to give effect to this arrangement, and the result has been satisfactory to all parties, as was proved by the sale above referred to. At the same time there were submitted ten new shares in the New River Company of £100 each, £40 per share paid, and these realised £100 per share, being equal to a premium of £150 per cent.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

EXAMINATIONS AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

Trinity Term, 1874.

FINAL EXAMINATION.

At the examination of candidates for admission on the roll of attorneys and solicitors of the superior courts, the examiners recommended the following gentlemen, under the age of twenty-six, as being entitled to honorary distinction :—

Richard Sneade Brown, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Vizard, Crowder, & Anstie, of London.

John Henry Jones, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Jones & Richards, of Gloucester, and Messrs. Morley & Shirreff, of London.

William Mark Pybus, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Hoyle, Shipley, & Hoyle, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Thomas Fisher, jun., who served his clerkship to Messrs. Ryland, Martineau, & Carslake, of Birmingham, and Messrs. Sharpe, Parkers, Pritchard, & Co., of London.

Charles Henry Morton, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Avison, & Boult, of Liverpool.

The Council of the Incorporated Law Society have accordingly awarded the following prizes of books :—

To Mr. Brown, the prize of the Honourable Society of Clifford's Inn.

To Mr. Jones, the prize of the Honourable Society of New Inn.

To Mr. Pybus, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Morton, prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

The examiners have also certified that the following candidates, under the age of twenty-six, passed examinations which entitled them to commendation :—

Louis Errington Bolinbroke, who served his clerkship to Mr. Elijah Crosier Bailey, of Norwich, and Messrs. G. F. Hudson, Matthews, Lopez, & Coupland, of London.

John Storey Clowes, who served his clerkship to Mr. John Clowes, of Great Yarmouth, Messrs. Rodgers, Thomas, & Swift, of Sheffield, and Messrs. Bell, Brodrick, & Gray, of London.

John David Davies, who served his clerkship to Mr. John Jenkins, of Llanidloes.

John Henry Flower, who served his clerkship to Messrs. J. O. Taylor & Son, of Norwich, and Messrs. Whites, Renard, & Co., of London.

Charles Davidson Forster, who served his clerkship to Mr. Benjamin Woodman, of Morpeth, and Messrs. E. Flux & Leadbitter, of London.

Maurice Samuel Rubinstein, who served his clerkship to Mr. Thomas Russel Kent, of London.

Walter Scowcroft, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Hall & Rutter, of Bolton, and Mr. James Gooden, of Bolton.

John Robert Shittler, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Ticehurst & Sons, of Cheltenham, and Messrs. Merediths, Roberts, & Mills, of London.

The Council have accordingly awarded them certificates of merit.

The number of candidates examined in this term was 229 ; of these, 196 passed, and 33 were postponed.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, July 10, 1874.

¾per Cent. Consols, 92⅞xd	Annuities, April, '85 9⅞
Ditto for Account, Aug 92¾xd	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
3 per Cent. Reduced 92⅝	Ex Bills, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 4 pm.
New 3 per Cent., 92⅝	Ditto, £500, Do 4 pm,
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, 4 pm.
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 5 Ct. (last half-year) 259
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ditto for Account.
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 108xd	Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79 102
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto Debentures, per Cent April, '64 —
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct '88 103	Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 100½
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000
Ditto Enfaced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 96½	Ditto, ditto, under £1000
Ind. Enf. Pr., 5 p C., Jan. '72	

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	126
Stock	Caledonian	100	91½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	—
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	43½
Stock	Great Northern	100	138½
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	153½
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	107
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	119½
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	144¼
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	78
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	20½
Stock	London and North-Western	100	149
Stock	London and South Western	100	112½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	70
Stock	Metropolitan	100	59
Stock	Do., District	100	28½
Stock	Midland	100	126
Stock	North British	100	60½
Stock	North Eastern	100	165⅝
Stock	North London	100	109
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	64
Stock	South Devon	100	64
Stock	South-Eastern	100	110½

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

There has been no alteration in the Bank rate. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has risen from about 39 per cent. last week to over 42½ per cent. this week. There has been gradually increasing firmness in the railway market in the latter part of this week. On Wednesday there was also a considerable improvement in the Foreign market, which on Friday last had—as regards the speculative descriptions—a rather rapid fall, amounting almost to a panic. Consols on Thursday closed 92½ to ¾ for delivery.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

By Messrs. WILKINSON & HORNE.

Ealing—Florence-road, two plots of freehold building land—sold for £1,490.

Peckham—No. 106, Hill-street, term 12 years—sold for £70.

AT MACCLESFIELD.

By Messrs. T. ACTON & SONS.

Cheshire, near Macclesfield—The Henbury-hall Estate, comprising mansion, manor, and 926a. 1r. 23p., freehold—sold for £90,000.

AT OXFORD.

By Messrs. PAXTON & CASTLE.

Oxon, Dorchester—Freehold residence, and 327a. 0r. 7p., including a water corn mill—sold for £28,900.

AT BURY ST. EDMUNDS.

By Messrs. BIDDLE & BLENCOWE.

Suffolk, near Stowmarket—The Upland Hall Estate, comprising mansion and 207a. 0r. 7p.—sold for £15,000.

Risby—Farm-house, homestead, and 160a. 1r. 16p.—sold for £7,400.

A Farm-house, with outbuildings, and 45a. 1r. 0p.—sold for £3,150.

An enclosure, containing 8a. 0r. 27p.—sold for £460.

Tackford-close, containing 3a 0r. 18p.—sold for £235.

Seven cottages—sold for £605.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

BOUCHER—On July 3, at Wiveliscombe, the wife of Benjamin Boucher, solicitor, of a son.

DU BOULAY—On June 22, at Gipsy-hill, Upper Norwood, the wife of Arthur H. Du Boulay, barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

BAKER—SCLATER—On July 2, at Newick, Nathaniel Baker, Esq, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, to Cecil Jane, eldest daughter of James H. Sclater, Esq., of Newick Park, Sussex.

ELWELL—GOOCH—On July 8, at St. George's, Hanover-square, William Charles Boden Elwell, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, to Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the Dowager Lady Gooch.

GORDON—HALL—On July 7, Henry Gordon, Esq., of Manar, to Ellen, youngest daughter of the Hon. Vice-Chancellor Sir Charles Hall.

SAWBRIDGE—ORTON—On July 2, at St. Mary's, Stoke Newington, Charles Sawbridge, of Milk-street, Cheapside, and Highbury-crescent, solicitor, to Mary Anne, youngest daughter of the late Thomas Orton, of Mansfield, Notts.

DEATHS.

IVENS—On July 7, at Lutterworth, Edward Ivens, solicitor aged 46.

STONE—On June 30, at Church-terrace, Bicester, George William Stone, solicitor and registrar of the Bicester County Court, aged 69.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, July 3, 1874.

Hall, John, and J. Martin Rutter, attorneys and solicitors, Acresfield, Bolton. June 30

Broughall, John, and John William Broughall, attorneys and solicitors, St John's Hill, Shrewsbury. June 30

Wood, Charles Paul, James Henry Street, and Thomas Hayter, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn, Middlesex. June 30

TUESDAY, July 7, 1874.

Foster, Thomas, and Lionel William Winship, Attorneys at Law, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. June 22

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

TUESDAY, June 30, 1874.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Mildenhall and Hundred of Lackford Permanent Benefit Building Society.—Petition for winding up, presented June 22, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on Friday, July 10. Lawson, Lombard st, solicitor for the petitioner.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Dimson Estate Fire Clay Company, Limited.—V.C. Malins has, by an order, dated June 25, appointed William Slingsby Ogle, Finsbury place, South, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Aug 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Thursday, Oct 29, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

Midland Counties Hide, Skin, and Fat Market Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated June 20, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Greenfield, Lancaster place, Strand, agent for Belk, Nottingham, solicitor for the petitioners.

Tall and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 30, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 11. Waller and Handson, solicitors for the petitioner.

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

Great North Caradon Silver, Lead, and Copper Mining Company, Limited.—By an order made by the Vice Warden, dated June 25, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Paul, Truro, agent for Flux and Leadbitter, Leadenhall st, solicitors for the petitioner.

Great South Chiverton Mining Company.—By an order made by the Vice Warden, dated June 24, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Hodge and Co, Truro, petitioners' solicitors.

Perran Consols Tin Mining Company, Limited.—By an order made by the Vice Warden, dated June 24, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Paul, Truro, solicitor for the petitioners.

FRIDAY, July 3, 1874.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Leamington and Warwick Tramways.—V.C. Malins has, by an order, dated June 10, appointed George Lindsay Watson, Birmingham, to be Official liquidator.

Norwich Provident Insurance Society.—By an order made by V.C. Bacon, dated July 1, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the Society should be continued.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Continental and Shipping Butter Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 1, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 11. Lumley, Scarsville st, Piccadilly, solicitors for the petitioners.

Hereford and South Wales Waggon and Engineering Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before July 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Arbuthnot, and Edward Brown, care of Mr. Ellis, St Swithin's lane. Friday, August 7, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Stock, Share, and Finance Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall has fixed July 15 at 12, at his chambers, Chancery lane, for the appointment of an Official Liquidator.

Tall and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 30, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 11. Waller and Handson, King street, solicitors for the petitioner.

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

North Wheal Crafty Mining Company.—Petition for winding up, presented June 29, directed to be heard before the Vice Warden, at the Prince's Hall, Truro, on Tuesday July 28. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing, in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the registrar's office, Truro, on or before July 11, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioner, his solicitors, or their agents. Hodge and Co, agents for Southgate and Watson King's Bench walk, solicitors for the petitioner.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, June 30, 1874.

Andrews, Eliza Emma, Flora cottages, West green, Tottenham. July 21. Smith v Mantz, V.C. Hall. Helsham, Sherborne lane

Belchamber, William, Horsham, Sussex, Carrier. July 21. King v Belchamber, M.R. Medwin and Davis, Horsham

Brearey, John Joseph, Dewsbury, York, Gent. July 21. Brearey v Brearey, V.C. Malins. Pitman, Nicholas lane

Burcham, Richard, Union rd, Rotherhithe, House Agent. Aug 1 Brackenbury v Outhwaite, V.C. Hall. Reece, Furnival's inn, Holborn

Campbell, Robert, Birmingham, Brassfounder. July 25. Whittall v Jones, M.R. Smith, Northumberland st, Strand

Chubb, John, St Paul's churchyard, Lock Manufacturer. Aug 1. Vanner v Chubb, V.C. Hall. Holmes, Threadneedle st

Cumming, Simon Fraser, Nailsworth, Gloucester. Aug 1. Cumming v Cumming, V.C. Hall. Whitehouse, Charles st, St James' square

Drawbridge, Rev Thomas Oben, Rodmersham, Kent. July 25. Nicholls v Drawbridge, V.C. Hall. Bertie, Great James st, Bedford row

Goddard, Rev George Ashe, otherwise George Ashe Innes, Buntingford, Hertford. July 28. Archer v Parker, M.R. Oldershaw, Bell yard, Doctors' commons

Gordon, James Brodie, Northam, Devon, Gent. Aug 21. Cooper v Gordon, V.C. Hall. Robins, Lincoln's inn fields

Henderson, Elizabeth, Liverpool. July 30. Moses v Moses, V.C. Hall. Clare, Liverpool

Jones, John, Trefwtlal, Cardigan, Farmer. July 27. Lewis v Jones, V.C. Hall. Evans, Cardigan

Moore, Sarah, Shoreditch, Coffee house Keeper. July 27. Moore v Potter, V.C. Hall. Sampson and Co, Finsbury circus

Riles, Samuel, Redhill, Surrey, Gent. July 31. Tams v Riles, V.C. Malins. Spyer, Winchester house, Old Broad st

Smith, Peter, Sanford place, Stoke Newington common, Esq. July 21. Russell v St Aubyn, V.C. Bacon. Crowder, Lincoln's inn fields

Talbot, Mary Matilda, Sandringham gardens, Ealing. July 24. Talbot v Frere, M.R. Frere, Lincoln's inn fields

Williams, Hurman, Oswestry, Salop, Farmer. July 22. Jennings v Williams, M.R. Dawson and Co, Bedford square

Yapp, Richard, Halesend, Hereford, Esq. July 21. Yapp v Williams, V.C. Hall. Mason, Furnival's inn

FRIDAY, July 3, 1874.

Ashley, John, Hightown, Birstal, York, Surgeon. Aug 20. Parkins v Parkins, M.R. Learoyd, Huddersfield

Batterbury, Richard, Albert st, Mornington crescent, Builder. Sept 3. City of London Brewery Company, Limited, v Batterbury, M.R. Western, Great James st, Bedford row

Birtles, Thomas, Cross Town, Nether Knutsford, Cheshire, Provision Dealer. July 30. Leicester v Barker, M.R. Hinde, Altrincham

Booty, William, High st, Notting Hill, Upholsterer. Aug 8. Vigers v Booty, V.C. Hall. Goddard, South square, Grays' inn

Chappell, John, Brunswick place, City rd. July 25. Chappell v Clark, V.C. Malins. Rooks, King st, Cheapside

Da Costa, Aaron Gomes, Gower st, Merchant. Nov 2. Da Costa, v Da Costa, M.R. Emanuel, Finsbury circus

Hoskins, Edwin, Nantyglo, Innkeeper. Sept 1. Hoskins v Webb, V.C. Hall. Harris, Tredegar

Hewarth, Joseph, Deighton, York, Manufacturing Chemist. July 27. Harrison v Walsnaw, V.C. Malins. Sykes, Huddersfield

Kearsley, George, Manchester, Coach Builder. July 24. Kearsley v Kearsley, V.C. Bacon. Kearsley, Manchester

Laws, William, Prudhoe Castle, Northumberland, Gent. Aug 20. Rogers v Laws, M.R. Leadbitter, Leadenhall st

Molyneux, Annie Machell, Allerton Hall, Lancashire. July 30. Littledale v Bickersteth, V.C. Hall. Eaton and Son, Clayton square, Liverpool

Patterson, John Hotson, Plymouth, Devon, Captain in the Merchant Service. Aug 1. Patterson v Fowler, V.C. Malins. Edmonds, Plymouth

Phillipps, Richard Marshall, Manor Lodge, Holloway, Esq. Aug 1. Phillipps v Phillipps, V.C. Malins. Gribble, Abchurch lane

Strickland, Thomas, Potton, Bedford, Brewer. July 30. Cooper v Cooper, M.R. Nash, Royston

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, June 30, 1874.

Alexander, William, Hornton st, Kensington, Gent. July 27. Oblein, Queen Victoria st

Andrews, John, Totteridge, Herts, Esq. Aug 10. Hopwood and Sons, Chancery lane

Andrews, Mary, Totteridge, Herts. Aug 10. Hopwood and Sons, Chancery lane

Angell, Benedict John, Curzon st, Mayfair, Esq. Aug 13. Wilde and Co, College hill

Barrett, Charles Carter, Wimborne Minster, Dorset, Adjutant. Aug 1. Rawlins

Barry, James, Hoxton, near Bolton, Lancashire, Gent. Aug 1. Gregory and Co, Bedford row

Bridger, Sarah Louisa, Brighton, Sussex. Sept 1. Clarke and Howlett, Brighton

Campanile, Luigi, Cheyne row, Chelsea, Professor of Music. Aug 10. Dalston, Piccadilly
Cluff, William, Spital square, Shoreditch, Silk Manufacturer. July 31. Lewis and Whitbourne, Basinghall st
Cooper, Henry, Salisbury, Wilts, Gent. Aug 1. Ottaway, Salisbury
Devis, James, Edgbaston, Warwick, Gent. Aug 10. Whateley and Co Birmingham
Ellis, John, Plymouth, Devon, Labourer. Aug 1. Curtis, East Stonehouse
Evans, George, Brighton, Sussex, Riding Master. Aug 7. Woods and Dempster, Brighton
Fenwick, William, Hillingdon, Middlesex, Esq. Aug 15. Western and Sons, Great James st, Bedford row
Gardner, Richard, Liverpool, Gent. Aug 1. Payne and Son, Liverpool
Grice, John, Millholm, Bootle, Cumberland, Merchant. July 31. Brockbank and Helder, Whitehaven
Grizzell, George, Kemerton, Gloucester, Cordwainer. Aug 15. Browne, Tewkesbury
Grizzell, William, Kennerton, Gloucester, Grocer. Aug 15. Brown, Tewkesbury
Helps, Rev William, Lansanna rd, Peckham. Dec 1. Tompson and Co, Stone buildings, Lincoln's inn
Jones, Jenkin, Canton, near Cardiff, Glamorgan, Master Mariner. July 8. Grover and Grover, Cardiff
Mawdesley, Joseph, Alsager, Chester, Commission Agent. Aug 31. Tomkinson, Burslem
Musker, Mary, Bootle, Lancashire. July 21. Harvey and Alsop, Liverpool
Musker, Robert, Bootle, Lancashire, Gent. July 21. Harvey and Alsop, Liverpool
Popple, Catharine, John Poppel, Spalding, Lincoln, Baker. Aug 8. Staniland and Wigelsworth, Boston
Savery, William, Gaze Alders, Devon, Yeoman. Aug 14. Savery
Swallow, Joshua, sen, Ossett, York, Cloth Dresser. Aug 1. Wainwright and Co, Wakefield
Taylor, Henry, Maida vale, Cocoa, Chocolate, and Mustard Manufacturer. Aug 25. Taylor, Old Burlington st
Taylor, John, Garstang, Lancashire, Tailor. Aug 1. Charnley and Co, Preston
Tolley, James, Birmingham, Engraver. Aug 5. Clarke, Birmingham
Whitley, Henry, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Gent. Aug 8. Cripps, Tunbridge Wells
Wynne-Finch, Charles, Voclas, Denbigh, Esq. Aug 27. Lucas and Coe, Argyle st, Regent st

FRIDAY, July 3, 1874.

Ames, Henry Metcalfe, Queen's gate, South Kensington, Esq. Sept 1. Taylor and Co, Furnival's inn
Bigge, Charles Richard, Chepstow Villas, Bayswater, Esq. Aug 1. Jenkyn, Lincoln's inn fields
Brockholes, Thomas Fitzherbert, Claughton Hall, Lancashire, Esq. Aug 15. Weld, Liverpool
Cave, Robert, New Windsor, Berks, Fishmonger. Aug 4. Phillips, New Windsor
Chauncy, Lucy Hannah, Frome, Somerset. Aug 1. Nicholson and Herbert, Spring gardens
Cornwallis, Right Hon Lady Elizabeth, Charles st, Berkely square. Sept 30. Davidson, Spring gardens
Fernley, John, Southport, Lancashire, Esq. Aug 31. Field and Weightman, Liverpool
Gallop, Richard, Cassland crescent, South Hackney, Gent. Aug 7. Hobbs and Sinnott, Bristol
Hansen, Peter Wotton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Merchant. Aug 1. Sewell, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Hargreaves, John, Blackburn, Lancashire, Gent. Aug 1. Hargreaves, Blackburn
Hast, Mary, Southampton. Aug 31. Green and Moberly, Southampton
Hast, Philip, Southampton, Lieutenant, R. N. Aug 31. Green and Moberly, Southampton
Hildyard, Henry, The Willows, Surrey, Esq. Aug 15. Norton and Co, Victoria st, Westminster
Jeke, John, Oakley, Stafford, Farm Bailiff. Sept 30. Pearson, Market Drayton
Illingworth, Rev William, Luzley Brook, Lancaster, Wesleyan Minister. Aug 1. Harrison and Smith
Lees, Solomon, Southport, Lancashire, Gent. Sept 1. Parr and Sadler, Southport
Nicholas, Ann, Hounslow. Aug 12. Surr and Co, Abchurch lane
Nicols, Rev Bartholomew, Brighton. Aug 15. Walker and Co, Furnival's inn
Peppie, Catharine, Lincoln, Spalding. Aug 8. Staniland and Wigelsworth, Boston
Robertson, Eben William, Chilcote, Derby, Esq. Aug 31. Murray, Whitehall place
Rowland, Edward Hervey, Carlisle, Esq. Sept 1. Nanson and Clatterbuck, Carlisle
Saddington, Samuel, Arundel square, Islington, Australian Merchant. Aug 12. Robinson and Co, Charter house square
Townsend, James, Stapleton, Gloucester, Gent. July 14. Osborne and Co, Bristol
Verey, James, Kidlington, Oxford. Aug 15. Mallam, Oxford
Ward, Rev Charles, Charfield, Gloucester. Aug 1. Bonnor
Wells, John, Oakley st, Lambeth, Licensed Victualler. Aug 10. Walters and Gush, Finsbury circus
Willacy, Richard, Liverpool, Gent. Aug 25. Masters and Fletcher, Liverpool

TUESDAY, June 30, 1874.

Archer, Matthew Thomas, Newick, Sussex, Esq. Aug 15. Puckle, Bennett's hill, Doctors' commons
Arnott, Neil, Cumberland terrace, Regent's park Doctor, Sept 7. Morice, Serjeant's inn, Fleet st
Balmer, Richard, Curlieu Carlton, Leicester, Grazier. Oct 1. Ingram, Leicester
Bell, James, Spring grove, Isleworth, Esq. Aug 15. Potter, King st, Cheapside
Butler, Thomas, Borough High st, Southwark, Retired Pork Butcher. Aug 10. Oldershaw, Bell yard, Doctors' commons
Chetwode, Elizabeth Sophia, Princes terrace, Hyde Park. Aug 5. Gold, Serjeant's inn, Chancery lane
Child, Sarah, Grove place, Brompton. Sept 1. Horn and Murray, Berkely st, Piccadilly
Daniel, Richard, Worcester, Fruiterer. Sept 1. Thompson
Druce, Samuel, Eynsham, Oxford, Land Agent. Aug 20. Hawkins, Oxford
Elliott, Thomas, Beansale, Warwick, Farmer. Aug 22. Abraham Ball, Haseley Mill, Warwick
Faviell, Samuel Clough, Leeds, Civil Engineer. July 21. Bond and Barwick, Leeds
Flather, David, Sheffield, Steel Manufacturer. Aug 10. Broomhead and Co, Sheffield
Hake, Thomas, Taunton, Somerset, Furrier. Aug 15. White and Son, Williton
Hewitt, Anne, Odiham, Southampton. Aug 29. Lamb and Brooks, Odiham
Knights, Charles, Beeston next Mileham, Norfolk, Farmer. Aug 10. Wright and Barton
Lloyd, Sophia Catherine Martha, Llangadock, Carmarthen. Sept 1. Price, Talley House, near Llandilo
Lockey, Emm Anna, Swainswick, near Bath. Aug 20. Cunliffe and Beaumont, Chancery lane
Lofft, Thomas, Epping, Essex, Esq Aug 4. Gregg, Kirby Lonsdale
Lowry, Eliza, Carlisle, Cumberland. Aug 20. Hough, Carlisle
Marsland, Richard, Altham, Lancashire, Labourer. Aug 3. Whalley, Accrington
Martin, William John, Landsdowne rd, Croydon. Aug 20. Barfield, Plowden buildings, Temple
McDonald, John, Holyhead, Anglesey. Aug 1. Louis, Ruthin
Neale, Frederick William, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Hatter. Aug 1. Neale, Dudley st, Wolverhampton
Nightingale, Walter Crittenden, Upper Tooting, Surrey, Job and Post Master. Sept 1. Sturt, Ironmonger lane
Panton, James, Wareham, Dorset, Gent. Aug 6. Marsfield and Hutchings, Wareham
Paul, Edmund William, Buckerell, Devon, Solicitor. Sept 5. James, Exeter
Sayle, Thomas, Brighton, Sussex. Oct 8. Coleman and Sangster, Pontefract
Thorley, James, Congleton, Cheshire, Cooper. Aug 1. Latham, Congleton
Walker, John Gunn, Seaham Harbour, Durham, Shipwright. July 31. Johnson and Featherall, Temple
Walwyn, Thomas, Fauld Hall, Stafford, Farmer. Sept 29. Redfern, Leek
Warre, Emma, Bishop's Lydeard, Somerset. Oct 1. Beadon and Sweet, Taunton
Warre, Henry, Bishop's Lydeard, Somerset, Esq. Oct 1. Beadon and Sweet, Taunton
Williams, Hugh, Park, Llandrygarn, Anglesey, Farmer. Aug 1. Louis, Ruthin
Wood, Charles, Manchester, Gent. Aug 17. Chapman and Co, Manchester

Bankrupts.

TUESDAY, June 30, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Da Costa, Luiz Augusto, King st, Cheapside, Merchant. Pet June 25. Pepys. July 14 at 11
Lancaster, Charles James Sear, Rosendale, West Dulwich, Manager of Sand Pits. Pet June 25. Pepys. July 14 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Haycroft, Frederick Taylor, Salford, Lancashire, Fire Light Manufacturer. Pet June 25. Hulton. Salford, July 15 at 11
Levy, N H , Manchester, Oil Merchant. Pet June 25. Kay. Manchester, July 17 at 9.30
Radford, William, Patricroft, Lancashire, Painter. Pet June 27. Hulton. Salford, July 15 at 11
Wright, John, Robert, Ringstead, Norfolk, Grocer. Pet June 25. Partridge. King's Lynn, July 10 at 12

FRIDAY, July 3, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Cochran, John, London wall, Gas Engineer. Pet June 24. Spring-Rice. July 17 at 2
Elliot, John Charles, Oakley st, Chelsea, Farmer. Pet June 30. Hazlitt. July 14 at 11
Merrin, Henry, Redcross st, Crinoline Skirt Manufacturer. Pet July 1. Spring-Rice. July 17 at 12.30
Pollard, Edward Hutchinson, St Petersburgh, Russia. Pet June 29. Brougham. July 17 at 11
Williams, Edwin, Olney st, Walworth rd, Coal Merchant. Pet June 29. Brougham. July 17 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Cotterell, Andrew, Birmingham, Jeweller. Pet June 30. Chauntler. Birmingham, July 15 at 2
Dods, John Thomas, Boston, Lincoln, out of business. Pet June 29. Staniland. Boston, July 17 at 12.30
Dunderdale, Thomas, jun, Eccleshill, York, Worsted Stuff Manufacturer. Pet June 30. Darlington. Bradford, July 17 at 9
Harrison, Titus George, Bucknall, Stafford, Joiner. Pet June 26. Challinor. Hanley, July 17 at 11
King, Thomas John, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Smack Owner. Pet June 29. Walker. Great Yarmouth, July 15 at 12
Parker, John, Halliwell, Lancashire, Joiner. Pet June 30. Holden. Bolton, July 16 at 10
Pilling, David, Southport, Lancashire, out of business. Pet June 29. Watson. Liverpool, July 16 at 2
Smith, John, Farrington, Hereford, Cattle Salesman. Pet June 30. Crisp. Worcester, July 17 at 12
Wilde, William Samuel, Bristol, Builder. Pet June 30. Harley. Bristol, July 20 at 12

Young, Charles, Liverpool, Tailor. Pet June 29. Watson. Liverpool, July 20 at 2

TUESDAY, July 7, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debt to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Benham, Joseph, Markham st, Chelsea. Pet July 3. Roche. July 21 at 12

Lacy, Henry, Bark place, Bayswater, Schoolmaster. Pet July 3. Roche. July 21 at 12.30

To Surrender in the Country.

James, Henry, Bath, Somerset, Licensed Victualler. Pet July 4. Smith. Bath, July 21 at 11

Mills, George, Dover, Kent, Coal Merchant. Pet July 3. Furley. Canterbury, July 20 at 2

Nilsson, Carl, Sunderland, Durham, Ship Chandler. Pet July 1. Ellis. Sunderland, July 18 at 12

Warrener, Thomas, Darlington, Durham, Grocer. Pet July 4. Crosby. Stockton-on-Tees, July 21 at 3

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, June 30, 1874.

Graves, William Henry, Southsea, Hants, no trade. June 25

FRIDAY, July 3, 1874.

Rendall, Simon, Bassein park rd, Shepherd's Bush, attorney. March 26
Banks, James, Everton, near Liverpool, Mercantile Clerk. June 26
Fuchs, Adam Joseph, Wandsworth rd, Baker. June 9

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, July 3, 1874.

Allen, Job, Bath, Watch Manufacturer. July 15 at 12 at offices of Lomas and Co, Cannon st, Birmingham. Bartram, Bath
Auty, Joseph, and John Smith, Dewsbury, York. July 17 at 11 at the Scarborough Hotel, Dewsbury
Barrett, Edmond, Leeds, Provision Merchant. July 16 at 3 at offices of North and Sons, East parade, Leeds
Bate, Thomas, Bromley, Stafford, Miner. July 17 at 11 at offices of Chilow, High st, Brierley
Beckett, Joseph, Miserden, Gloucester, Innkeeper. July 21 at 11 at offices of Warman, Kendrick st, Stroud
Berrisford, John, Congleton, Cheshire. July 16 at 11 at offices of Sherratt, Kidsgrove
Blyth, Robert James, and Charles George Blyth, Bury st, St Mary-axe, Warehouseman. July 28 at 3 at offices of Lawrance and Co, Old Jewry chambers
Bostel, Daniel Thomas, Brighton, Sussex, Sanitary Engineer. July 15 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee house. Black and Co, Brighton
Boyes, George, Narborough, Leicester, Nurseryman. July 15 at 3 at offices of Haxby, Belvoir st, Leicester
Bright, Humphrey, Lanark villas, Maida Hill, Greengrocer. July 16 at 2 at offices of Harris, Duke st, Manchester square
Broadbent, John, and William Woodville, Shelmerdine, Bradford, near Manchester, Manufacturing Chemists. July 22 at 11 at offices of Mann, Marsden st, Manchester
Butler, William, Scorning, Norfolk, Innkeeper. July 15 at 12 at offices of Stanley, Bank plain, Norwich
Chapman, Thomas, Hawthorn, Wilmington, Kent, Brewer. July 16 at 12 at offices of Parish, Queen Victoria st. Gibson, Dartford
Christie, James, Kingston-upon-Hull, Accountant. July 13 at 3 at offices of Laverack, Land of Green Ginger, Kingston-upon-Hull
Clarke, Josiah, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer. July 13 at 11 at offices of Jeffery, Market square, Northampton
Collins, William, Curtain rd, Cabinet Maker. July 16 at 3 at offices of Taylor and Jaquet, South st, Finsbury square
Corner, John, City rd, Boot Manufacturer. July 11 at 11 at offices of Nicholson, London bridge Railway approach. Sole and Co, Aldermanbury
Davey, Albion, Bath, Chemist. July 16 at 3 at offices of Moule and Co, Northumberland buildings, Bath
Davies, John, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Master Builder. July 17 at 11 at 40, Thomas st, Llanelly. Rees
Dawkins, Henry, Desborough terrace, Harrow rd, Paddington, Builder. July 13 at 3 at offices of Bullock, St Mary's square, Paddington
Ellis, Edward, Aberystwith, Cardigan, Grocer. July 15 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, Dale st, Liverpool. Jones, Aberystwith
Fage, Harry, Hoiford st, Mile End. July 8 at 1 at 1, Twemlow terrace, London Fields, Hackney. Hicks
Farmer, Harry, Northampton, Greengrocer. July 17 at 3 at offices of Becke, Market square, Northampton
Foster, Daniel John, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. July 16 at 3 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st, Birmingham
French, William Henry White, Ratiton rd, Herne hill, Clerk. July 11 at 2 at offices of Morphett, Moorgate st. Cotton, Coleman st
Gardner, James Frederick, Gough st, Gray's inn rd. July 27 at 3 at offices of Yeo and Warner, Hart st, Bloomsbury square
Glover, Edward, Wakefield, York, Cloth Merchant. July 16 at 4 at offices of Barr and Co, South parade, Leeds
Godley, Henry, St John's rd, Hoxton, Baker. July 16 at 4 at 3, Sion college, London wall. East and Funeton
Goodwin, Joseph, Manchester, Fustian Dealer. July 13 at 3 at 32, Russell st, Every st, Manchester. Goodwin
Grinstead, William, Dorking, Surrey, Builder. July 23 at 3 at offices of Young, West st. Dorking
Gordon, Patrick Pirie, Talbot rd, Westbourne Park, Coffee Planter July 24 at 2 at offices of Lawrance and Co, Old Jewry chambers
Gudgin, Henry, Hawnes, Bedford, Beer Retailer. July 20 at 11 at offices of Tebbs, St Peter's green, Bedford
Hammett, William Henry, Victoria Dock rd, Outfitter. July 17 at 2 at offices of Swaine, Cheapside
Hancher, John, Birmingham, Iron Founder. July 14 at 3 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st, Birmingham
Harold, Charles, Liverpool, Furniture Dealer. July 17 at 3 at offices of Lawrence and Dixon, Harrington st, Liverpool
Harris, Jacob Morris, Waterloo rd, Rag Merchant. July 15 at 10 at offices of Goatly, Westminster Bridge rd
Harris, William, Gloucester, Pastry Cook. July 17 at 2 at the Booth Hall Hotel, Westgate st, Gloucester. Jackson, Stroud
Hawkes, Dennis, Chesterton, Cambridge, Cattle Dealer. July 17 at 2.30 at offices of Adcock, Regent st, Cambridge
Hindley, Thomas, Bolton, Lancashire, Pawnbroker. July 17 at 3 at the Manchester Arms Inn, Corporation st, Manchester. Dawson, Bolton
Hodgson, Joseph, Leeds, Woollen Manufacturer. July 15 at 2 at the Victoria Hotel, Great George st, Leeds. Davy
Hook, Charles William Frederick, Southtown, Suffolk, Baker. July 21 at 12 at offices of Blake, Quay chambers, Great Yarmouth. Palmer, Great Yarmouth
Horswell, John Ivey, Shoe lane, Fleet st, Eating house Keeper. July 15 at 3 at offices of Lewis, Hatton garden, Holborn
Hosken, James, Fenchurch st, Engineer. July 16 at 2 at offices of Lass, Cornhill. Wilkins and Co, St Swithin's lane
Hyland, Alfred Norman, Market buildings, Metropolitan Meat Market Butcher. July 13 at 3 at offices of Harris and Finch, Bridge chambers Borough High st, Southwark
Jackson, John Holt, Dee Banks, Chester, Gent. July 16 at 12 at offices of Walker and Smith, Abbey Gateway, Northgate st
Jacobs, Sidney, Camberwell New rd, Gent. July 9 at 3 at offices of Buckler and Co, Fenchurch st
Jeffery, Tom Brooks, Oxford, Cabinet Maker. July 17 at 11 at offices of Swearse, Corn Market st, Oxford
Johnson, George, Manchester, Umbrella Manufacturer. July 28 at 3 at offices of Cobbett and Co, Brown st, Manchester
Johnson, William, Bradford, York, Photographic Artist. July 20 at 3 at offices of Hutchinson, Piccadilly chambers, Bradford
Kersbaw, William, Halifax, Yorkshire, Worsted Spinner. July 17 at 11 at offices of Norris and Co, Halifax
Koester, Christian Jochn Carl, Maddox st, Regent st, Tailor. July 15 at 3 at offices of Lovett, King William st
Layland, Cornelius, Edgware rd, Dealer in Musical Instruments. July 16 at 3 at offices of Ditton, Ironmonger lane
Long, Albert Ashley, Chipping Norton, Oxford, Grocer. July 14 at 11 at offices of Mace, West st, Chipping Norton
Love, Alfred, Wimbledon, Surrey, Baker. July 24 at 1 at offices of Haynes, Grecian chambers, Devereux court, Temple
Luker, Charles Augustus, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler. July 16 at 3 at offices of Gibson and Bolland, South John st, Liverpool
Mason, John, Birmingham, Traveller. July 20 at 11 at offices of Caddick, New st, West Bromwich
McDermott, Thomas, High st, Leytonstone, Boot Maker. July 21 at 12 at offices of Moojen, St Benet's place, Gracechurch st
Miller, William, Leeds, Currier. July 14 at 12 at offices of Rooke and Midgley, Boar lane, Leeds
Mitchell, Alfred, Dewsbury, York, Grocer. July 15 at 3 at offices of Shaw, Bond st, Dewsbury
Morgan, John, Workington, Cumberland, Grocer. July 17 at 12 at offices of Hodgson and McKeever, Wigton
Mundy, Andrew James, Bath terrace, Nunhead Green, Peckham, Builder. July 15 at 3 at offices of Salaman, King st, Cheapside
Murphy, William, Liverpool, Builder. July 16 at 2 at offices of Gibson and Bolland, South John st, Liverpool. Parkinson, Liverpool
Nicholls, John Dunkerley, Salford, Lancashire, Builder's Agent. July 20 at 2 at offices of Tremewen, Bridge st, Manchester
Patch, Alfred, Martock, Somerset, Brewer. July 16 at 1 at the Choughs Hotel, Yeovil. Peren and McMillan, South Petherton
Perkin, Joseph, and Edwin Gowman Ough, Wakefield, York, Mat Manufacturers. July 18 at 2 at the Bull Inn, Westgate, Wakefield. Simpson and Burrell
Powell, Samuel, Brighton, Sussex, Leather Seller. July 14 at 3 at offices of Black and Co, Ship st, Brighton
Robeson, Thomas, Mount Pleasant, Gray's inn rd, Plaster Manufacturer. July 13 at 2 at offices of Poole, Bartholomew close
Robinson, George, Preston Bissett, Buckingham, Miller. July 18 at 11 at the Swan and Castle Hotel, Buckingham. Kilby and Son, Banbury
Robinson, Thomas, Eton, Buckingham, Grocer. July 22 at 2 at 9, Cloak lane, Cannon st. Hubbard, Long lane
Russell, Thomas, Bolton, Lancashire, Joiner. July 20 at 3 at offices of Ryley, Mawdsley st, Bolton
Sagar, John, Burnley, Lancashire, Boiler Coverer. July 16 at 3 at offices of Nowell, Hargreaves st, Burnley
Saunders, Joshua, Acock's Green, Worcester, Nurseryman. July 18 at 11 at offices of Duke, Christ church passage, Birmingham
Seys, George, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, late Superintendent of Police. July 16 at 3 at offices of Stroud, Clarence parade, Cheltenham
Sharples, John, and Frederick James Sharples, Bolton, Lancashire, Cotton Spinners. July 23 at 2 at offices of Dowling, Wood st, Bolton.
Shaw, John Proudfoot, Sunderland, Durham, Grocer. July 15 at 2 at offices of Dixon, High st West, Bishopwearmouth
Smith, Henry, Ripley, Derby, Tuner. July 21 at 11 at the Bell Hotel, Sadler gate, Derby. Curaham, Ripley
Snellgrove, George Sharman, and James Play Leech, Mark lane, Merchants. July 30 at 3 at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate st. Stocken and Jupp, Lime st square
Somerville, James, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Retired Captain. July 16 at 2 at offices of Tindell and Wooldridge, Ryde
Stephens, William, Brynmawr, Breconshire, Draper. July 18 at 12 at offices of Cox and Co, Market chambers, Brynmawr
Strangeways, Thomas, Crucifix lane, Bermondsey, Carman. July 11 at 12.30 at offices of Seale, Globe rd, Mile End
Taylor, Henry, Cirencester, Gloucester, Beerhouse Keeper. July 14 at 11 at offices of Hollings and Co, Cirencester
Temple, Edith, Old Grove House, Hampstead, Schoolmistress. July 15 at 2 at offices of Robinson and Preston, Lincoln's inn fields
Tucker, Frederick, Bethnal Green rd, Butcher. July 21 at 12 at offices of Plunkett, Gutter lane
Wells, John, Manchester, Dealer in Fancy Goods. July 20 at 3 at offices of Wilkins and Co, St Swithin's lane. Addleshaw and Warburton, Manchester
White, Edmund, Honiton, Devon, Grocer. July 20 at 1 at offices of Andrew, Bedford circus, Exeter. Every, Honiton
Williams, Griffith William, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler. July 16 at 2 at offices of Anderson, Duncan st, Birkenhead
Wrighton, William, Bradford, York, Grocer. July 17 at 3 at offices of Mossman, Horton rd, Bradford

TUESDAY, July 7, 1874.

Abrahams, Alfred John, Houndsditch, Dealer in Fancy Goods. July 20 at 3 at offices of Noon and Tiddeman, Blomfield st

Anderson, John, Hereford, Tobacconist. July 20 at 11 at the Green Dragon Hotel, Broad st, Hereford. James and Rodenham, Hereford

Ball, Lydia, Torquay, Devon, Baker. July 23 at 12 at offices of Carter and Son, Cary buildings, Abbey rd, Torquay

Barron, William, and John Barron, Farsley, York, Cloth Manufacturers. July 23 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st, Leeds

Benfell, Aquila Dan, Wokingham, Berks, Brick Manufacturer. July 22 at 3 at offices of Weeks and Watts, Broad st, Wokingham

Berrisford, John, Congleton, Cheshire, out of business. July 16 at 11 at the office of the registrar, King Edward st, Macclesfield, in lieu of the place originally named

Blake, Henry, Bristol, Baker. July 21 at 12 at offices of Harwood, Small st, Bristol

Bordessa, Elizabeth, Newport Monmouth, Shipbroker. July 17 at 2.30 at offices of Pain and Son, Dock st, Newport

Bordessa, Sarah, Newport, Monmouth, Shipbroker. July 21 at 10 at the New Bridge Inn, Bridge st, Newport. Bradgate, Manidee, near Newport

Brown, Sarah, Dudley, Worcester, Shopkeeper. July 16 at 11 at offices of Travis, Church lane, Tipton

Bureau, Augustus, Bristol, out of business. July 16 at 11 at offices of Miles and Read, Broad st, Bristol. Price, Bristol

Burr, George, Offord rd, Barnsbury, Cab Proprietor. July 14 at 2 at the Exchange Mart Room, Walbrook. Merriman and Co, Queen st

Bury, Thomas Walker, Bolton, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. July 24 at 12 at offices of Richardson, Wood st, Bolton

Bushby, Robert William, Bognor, Sussex, Farmer. July 18 at 3 at the Dolphin Hotel, Chichester. Nye, Brighton

Butler, Thomas, Manchester, Coal Merchant. July 27 at 11 at offices of Mann, Marsden st, Manchester

Channing, Thomas Edward Irish, Ashburton Grove, Holloway, Builder. July 21 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Pitman

Chapman, Edward, Dudley, Worcester, Haberdasher. July 16 at 11 at offices of Stokes, Priory st, Dudley

Clayton, Joseph, Manchester, Bleacher. July 30 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Coney, Ambrose, Damerham, Wilts, Carpenter. July 22 at 11 at the Bull Inn, Fisherton Anger. Moore and Bowers, Wimborne Minster

Couteau, John George Nives, Brompton rd Hairdresser. July 23 at 2 at offices of Coker, Cheapside. Miller, King st, Cheapside

Crossman, Robert, Cross, Somerset, Innkeeper. July 20 at 11 at offices of Shiner, Victoria st, Bristol. Chapman, Weston-super-Mare

Davies, Thomas, Malpas, Cheshire, Saddler. July 24 at 3 at offices of Churton, Eastgate buildings, Chester

Day, Samuel, Rochester, Kent, Baker. July 18 at 11 at offices of Hayward, High st, Rochester

Denby, Thomas, Bradford, York, Plumber. July 22 at 10 at offices of Berry and Robinson, Charles st, Bradford

Deporiu, John Baptist James, Union court, Old Broad st, Merchant. July 20 at 11 at 4, Union court. Marsden, Walbrook

Dungate, Charles Frederick, Hastings, Sussex, Grocer. July 20 at 12 at offices of Miller and Miller, Sherborne lane. Savory, Hastings

Edwards, William, Cosmo place, Russell square, Licensed Victualler. July 21 at 2 at offices of Layton, Budge row, Cannon st

Ellis, Henry, Witton Park, Durham, Draper. July 21 at 2 at offices of Patrick, Market place, Durham

Ellis, James Fitzwilliam, New Wortley, Leeds, Grocer. July 15 at 3 at offices of Billinton, Oxford row, Leeds

Erskine, Francis, and William Samuel Denby, Pendleton, Lancashire, Engineers. July 29 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Foster, Henry, Ladgrove Grove rd, Notting Hill, Grocer. July 16 at 3 at offices of Cleoburey, Cheapside

Fremlin, William Henry, Banwell, Somersetshire, Chemist. July 22 at 12 at offices of Barnard and Co, Lothbury. Fussell and Co, Bristol

Galeway, Thomas, jun, Leeds, Yorkshire, Grocer. July 17 at 2 at offices of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st, Leeds

Gerahty, Charles Echlin, Twickenham, Middlesex, Clerk in the Civil Service. July 20 at 4 at offices of Peard, Lincoln's inn fields

Grebham, Anne Hall, Porchester terrace, Uxbridge rd, Lodging House Keeper. July 14 at 2 at offices of Berry, Chancery lane

Grundy, Edwin Lendseer, Liverpool, Wine Merchant. July 17 at 3 at offices of Harvey and Alsop, Castle st, Liverpool

Hawksworth, James, Ashborne, Derby, Innkeeper. July 18 at 11 at the Green Man Inn, Ashborne. Wilson, Burton-on-Trent

Higginbotton, John Henry, Runcorn, Chester, Licensed Victualler. July 21 at 11 at offices of Linaker, High st, Runcorn

Hilliard, Osborne, Warwick rd, Paddington, Esq. July 20 at 1 at offices of Bennett, Furnival's inn

Hirst, Francis, Octavius, Sheffield, Chemist. July 13 at 12 at offices of Broomhead and Co, George st, Sheffield

Hugon, Gabriel, Great Tower st, Commission Merchant. July 22 at 2 at offices of Gold and Son, Serjeant's inn, Chancery lane

Isaac, John, jun, North Tawton, Devon, Coal Merchant. July 14 at 2, Gloucester place, Swansea, in lieu of the place originally named

Jacob, Lawrance Moses, and David Ovid Sandheim, Birmingham, Wholesale Jewellers. July 17 at 11 at offices of Hodgson, Waterloo st, Birmingham

John, Thomas Trewhella, St Ives, Cornwall, Draper. July 20 at 12 at Chubb's Hotel, Old Town st, Plymouth. Williams, jun, St Ives

Keen, James, Beighton, Derby, Builder. July 20 at 12 at offices of Mellor, Bank st, Sheffield

Kimber, Edward, West Harding st, Fetter lane, Manufacturer of Machinery. July 31 at 2 at Painters' Hall, Little Trinity lane. Pritchard and Co, Painters' Hall, Little Trinity lane

Knowles, Norman, Rawtenstall, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturer. July 28 at 3 at offices of Sale, Booth st, Manchester

Lersley, Philip, Little Exeter st, Strand st, Camden, Coach Builder. July 16 at 4 at 9, Lincoln's inn fields. Marshall

Leggett, Robert, Sudbury, Suffolk, Coachbuilder. July 15 at 2 at the Rose and Crown Hotel, Sudbury. Mumford, Sudbury

Molyneux, Thomas, Liverpool, Baker. July 21 at 3 at offices of Tetley and Lynch, Sweeting st, Liverpool

Morris, Alfred, Longton, Stafford, Grocer. July 16 at 11 at offices of Hawley, Stafford st, Longton

Newlen, Walter Edmund, Spring Grove, Kingston-on-Thames, Surrey, Bricklayer. July 29 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Bull's Pond rd, Islington

Nixon, George, Fenton, Stafford, out of business. July 23 at 11 at offices of Welch, Caroline st, Longton

Oakley, John William, Cheslyn, Stafford, Grocer. July 17 at 11 at offices of Bill, Bridge st, Walsall

Parlabean, Daniel (and not Parlabean as erroneously printed in the Gazette of June 30), Paternoster row, Diary Publisher. July 14 at 11 at Walbrook Estate Exchange Mart Room, Walbrook. Merriman and Co, Queen st

Oldfield, Samuel Edward, Rotherham, York, Barber. July 17 at 12 at offices of Badgers and Rhodes, High st, Rotherham

Pascoe, William, Newton Abbot, Devon, Broker. July 21 at 11 at the Craven Hotel, Craven st, Strand. Watts, Newton Abbot

Pothe, Hermann, and Edward Semple, Davis Marks, Chemists' Sundrymen. July 20 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Turner, King st, Cheapside

Redford, Samuel Royal, Dewsbury, York, Confectioner. July 20 at 3 at offices of Ibberson, Dewsbury

Rees, Edward, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Tailor. July 20 at 10.15 at offices of Howell, Park st, Llanelly

Reeves, George, Bracknell, Berks, Boot Maker. July 23 at 11 at offices of Elkins, Forbury, Reading

Rennison, Thomas Matson, Grewelthorpe, York, Cattle Dealer. July 22 at 2 at offices of Calvert, Masham

Scheider, Anton, Hamilton st, Camden Town, Baker. July 21 at 4 at offices of Beard and Son, Basinghall st

Scales, William Michael, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Shoemaker. July 17 at 11 at 12, Regent st, Cheltenham. Billings

Shaw, William Hirst, Rawfolds, Liversedge, York, Commercial Traveller. July 20 at 3 at offices of Carry, Cleckheaton

Sherry, James, Lanteport, Hants, Bootmaker. July 17 at 4 at offices of King, North st, Portsea

Sherwin, George, jun, Hanley, Stafford, Grocer. July 17 at 11 at offices of Stevenson, Cheapside Hanley

Simmons, Edward, Watford, Hertford, Cattle Dealer. July 18 at 11 at offices of Boydell, South square, Gray's inn

Smithson, Samuel, Dewsbury, York, Rag Merchant. July 20 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, Dewsbury. Shaw, Dewsbury

Southee, Charles Sankey, Boughton-under-Blean, Kent, Grocer. July 24 at 11 at offices of Baggs and Co, King st, Cheapside. Shearman

Steffen, Matthias, Cornwall rd, Lambeth, no occupation. July 21 at 11 at 35, Walbrook. Price

Sturgess, James, Manchester, Boot Manufacturer. July 21 at 3 at offices of Farrington, Mosley st, Manchester

Taylor, Whiley, and Charles Worthington, Peabody's buildings, Commercial st, Engineers' Factors. July 20 at 2 at the offices of the Trade Auxiliary Company, King st, Cheapside. Oliver, King st Cheapside

Thacker, George Kinder, Matlock, Derby, Grocer. July 15 at 11.30 at offices of Cowdell, Matlock Bridge

Thompson, Thomas Pospate, South Shields, Durham, Gasfitter. July 20 at 11 at offices of Dale, King st, South Shields

Tomlinson, Henry, Green Haworth, Lancashire, Flagger. July 22 at 3 at offices of Beck and Swift, Richmond terrace, Blackburn

Vallender, William, Corse, Gloucester, Innkeeper. July 18 at 12 at the Booth Hall, Westgate st, Gloucester. Jackson, Stroud

Ward, John, Newport, Isle of Wight, Stationer. July 22 at 1 at offices of Nicholls and Leatherdale, Old Jewry chambers. Urry

Watson, Lewis Grant, Victoria rd, Kensington, no occupation. July 27 at 3 at offices of Gardiner, Abchurch lane. Tucker, St Swithin's lane

Wearne, Edwin, Great Dover st, Cabs Dealer. July 16 at the Stoke Hotel, Stoke-upon-Trent, in lieu of the place originally named

Wilkins, William, Pimlico walk, Hoxton, Boot Manufacturer. July 15 at 3 at offices of Parker, Pavement, Finsbury

Wood, Alfred Thomas, and George Downs Joyce, Gracechurch st, Hatters. July 31 at 2 at 33, Gutter lane. Vanderpump, South square, Gray's inn

Wookey, Charles William, and James William Wills, Portishead, Somerset, Grocers. July 16 at 2 at offices of Beckingham, Albion chambers, Bristol

Woolliams, William, and Henry Woolliams, Great Missenden, Buckingham, Builders. July 18 at 11 at the Red Lion Inn, Great Missenden. Cheese, Amersham